REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 406 24
NEEDED RESEARCH ON ABLE WOMEN IN HONORS PROGRAMS, COLLEGE AND SOCIETY. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON TALENTED WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN COLLEGE.
BY- MITTERLING, PHILIP I.
COLORADO UNIV., BOULDER
REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-028 PUB DATE 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.84 146P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *COLLEGE PROGRAMS, *FEMALES, *ABLE STUDENTS, COLLEGE STUDENTS, *LONGITUDINAL STUDIES, HONORS CURRICULUM, GIFTED, BOULDER, COLORADO, INTERUNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (ICSS)

A CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE "INTER-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (ICSS)" IN COOPERATION WITH THE SCHOOL OF GENERAL STUDIES AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY WAS HELD FROM MAY 20 TO 23, 1964. THE CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES WERE (1) TO IDENTIFY SYSTEMATICALLY THE PROBLEMS OF ABLE WOMEN IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND SOCIETY, (2) TO STIMULATE NEW WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT THESE PROBLEMS, AND (3) TO DEVELOP REQUIREMENTS AND APPROACHES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND STUDY. THE CONFERENCE BROUGHT TOGETHER 75 PERSONS WORKING IN THE FIELD OF WOMEN'S EDUCATION. THE ACTIVITIES INCLUDED THREE MAJOR ADDRESSES, TWO PLENARY SESSIONS, EIGHT GROUP DISCUSSIONS, AND THE PREPARATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY REPORT. PARTIAL CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE WERE AS FOLLOWS--(1) ACTION RESEARCH (LIMITED TO DEMONSTRATING A POINT OR CONVINCING PEOPLE TO CHANGE PRACTICES) IS OFTEN PERFORMED WITH BUILT-IN BIASES, (2) SEPARATE DATA MUST BE KEPT FOR EACH SEX, (3) DEPENDABLE NEW KNOWLEDGE OF THE SORT NEEDED IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WILL RESULT FROM A 1-YEAR STUDY IN A COLLEGE OR IN A SPECIFIC HONORS PROGRAM, (4) LONGITUDINAL STUDIES ARE NECESSARY TO IDENTIFY VARIABLES RELATIVE TO WHICH STUDENTS ARE TO BE DISCUSSED, (5) RESEARCH CONDUCTED AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL LED SCHOLARS TO QUESTION THE COMPLETENESS OF FRAMES OF REFERENCE IN EVALUATING CERTAIN STUDENT BEHAVIOR AND ATTAINMENTS. IN TOTAL, THERE WERE 45 MORE INDICATIONS OF MEANINGFUL FINDINGS. (HB)

ED003406

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Proceedings of the Conference on Talented Women and the American College

Needed Research on Able Women in Honors Programs, College & Society.

Sponsored by the ICSS and
the U.S. Office of Education
in Cooperation with
School of General Studies,
Columbia University. Edited
by Philip I. Mitterling

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
CONFERENCE ON TALENTED WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN COLLEGE
Needed Research on Able Women in Honors Programs, College and Society

Cooperative Research Project No. F-028

Edited By

PHILIP I. MITTERLING

Sponsored by the Inter-university Committee on
the Superior Student and the United States
Office of Education, in cooperation with School
of General Studies, Columbia University

1964

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of
Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and
Welfare

FOREWORD

The phrase, "needed research" on the education of women, has become a cliche. A spate of conferences have called attention to the difference in the life line and the educational line of women and have emphasized that recognition of this is essential in planning women's higher education. Discrimination against women in employment and in the professions also has been a familiar theme. All previous conferences agreed that research on women was needed, yet no single effort on the part of educators and researchers had been focused on the problems of talented women in higher education and society before the conference of the Inter-university Committee on the Superior Student at Columbia University from May 20-23, 1964.

The purpose of this meeting was to identify the problems of able women in undergraduate education and in society, stimulate new ways of thinking concerning these problems, and most important to develop requirements and approaches for future research. Problems of research design, the need to make effective use of existing sources of information, as well as the desirability of developing new sources and studying them on a national scale were delineated.

Seventy-five persons, including specialists in research and in the education of women, members of the ICSS Executive Committee, and directors of honors programs in selected colleges and universities, met for three days of intensive discussion. The conference was financed by the United States Office of Education and planned in cooperation with Columbia's School of General Studies. We wish to express appreciation to Dr. Doris Gunderson, of the Office of Education's Cooperative Research Program, for assisting in the preparation of the conference proposal and for coordinating activities in Washington. Special thanks go to Professor Harold Pagliaro, Director of Honors in the School of General Studies. Without his capable handling of arrangements at Columbia and his many suggestions concerning plans, the conference could not have been held.

The ICSS also is indebted to Professor David Riesman, Diana Trilling, Professor Bruno Bettelheim, Professor E. Lowell Kelly and Professor Paul A. Heist for their important addresses. Success of the discussions depended upon the contributions of the discussion leaders and the conferees. If needed research becomes a reality instead of a cliche, it will be owing to their ideas and dedication.

Philip I. Mitterling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD i

THE TALENTED WOMAN IN AMERICAN SOCIETY
Bruno Bettelheim 1

THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEMPORARY LITERARY CULTURE ON THE GIFTED COLLEGE WOMAN
Diana Trilling 18

WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS
David Riesman 38

Plenary Session:
PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH: DESIGN DIFFICULTIES
E. Lowell Kelly 63

RESEARCH ON TALENTED WOMEN: PROBLEMS OF APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE SOURCES OF DATA
Paul A. Heist 76

Plenary Session:
SURVEY OF THE COLLEGE SCENE: WOMEN IN HONORS PROGRAMS
John S. Eells, Jr., Winthrop College 91
Kathleen O. Elliott, Radcliffe College 96
Sister Fides, The College of St. Catherine 100
Otto G. Graf, University of Michigan 106
Lucian C. Marquis, University of Oregon 112
Walter D. Weir, University of Colorado 117

Group Discussions:
IDENTIFYING AND PROMOTING THE EFFICIENT USE OF TALENT AMONG COLLEGE WOMEN 120
CHANGING THE HONORS UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FOR WOMEN: PROS AND CONS 123
PROBLEMS OF COUNSELING TALENTED UNDERGRADUATE WOMEN 125
CAREER CHOICES OF TALENTED WOMEN 128
AFTER HONORS AND GRADUATION: WHAT HAPPENS? 130
TALENTED WOMEN IN THE PROFESSIONS 132
REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY VARIATIONS IN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WOMAN OF TALENT 134
SPECIFIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING TALENTED WOMEN 136

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 139

THE TALENTED WOMAN IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

by

Bruno Bettelheim

I am told that recent surveys show that since the twenties the movement toward sex equality has slackened and in these sixties it seems that it is losing rather than gaining ground.[1] In regard to gifted, to college educated women, this is often viewed as problematic because of a stated need for highly trained people to maintain the well being of our society, and its place in the world.

In my remarks I shall steer clear of this particular issue, because I believe that what some self-appointed, and even the elected spokesmen at one time or another claim is necessary for society has often little to do with what makes for the true progress of man. This is particularly so if what is demanded is not in accord with the inner needs of the persons concerned, provided these needs are stripped of their possibly too selfish characteristics. I doubt that the desire for true human self-realization can ever be contrary to the best interests of society, that there can be an essential conflict between the interests of society and those of the individual, if both are correctly understood.

So since I believe that what is best for women is also best for the society in which they happen to live in, I can forget the claimed needs of society and in my thinking be guided only by what I believe to be in the best interest of this particular group of college educated women, convinced that what is best for them is also in the long run best for society.

At the present moment, American women do not seem to be trying to extend their claim to equality in the political, the occupational or even social arena; in their vast majority they do not seem interested in exercising the rights they won through bitterly fought battles during the early decades of this century. Their waning interest in higher education, as demonstrated by the fact that today a smaller proportion of college graduates are women than was true thirty years ago, is only part of a general withdrawal from interest in the public domain. Of women capable of doing college work, only one out of four do so, compared with a ratio of one out of two for men; in 1961 of all students planning to enter medicine only 6% were women, the percent of women planning to do graduate work in physics was 7%. Here one might think special talent, or its lack, accounted for the small percentage of women, but this hardly explains why only 7% of all those specializing in pharmacology were women, or only 10% of those entering graduate studies in business and administration. This is so, we are told, because young women seem increasingly uncommitted to anything beyond early marriage, motherhood, and a suburban existence. One of the students of this problem, Alice Rossi, comments that "There are few Noras in contemporary American society because women have deluded themselves that the doll's house is large enough to find complete personal fulfillment within it."[2]

---

[1] Alice S. Rossi, "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," Daedalus (Spring, 1964).

Now I am always suspicious if the protagonists of a cause accuse those not interested in it of deluding themselves. The truth of the matter is usually that those others far from deluding themselves meet the problem of their lives in ways which seem more appropriate to them or, probably more correct, the problems of their lives are different from those of the leaders of the cause. Maybe in regard to their participation in intellectual leadership contemporary American college women don't delude themselves at all, but simply know what they want. Maybe the present leaders of the feminist movement are behind their times and try to fight old battles all over again, while our college girls know that women have won the war for equality and are ready to settle down to a peaceful coexistence on this new basis. Maybe those are in error who think that, given the existing social arrangements, it is preferable for most intelligent women to pursue a profession when compared with settling down, for example, to a suburban existence. Whether this is so seems to me a question that cannot be answered on a priori grounds but needs to be investigated.

Maybe the difference in attitude between the feminists of the twenties and our college girls is akin to that between the abused who were and are fighting for the promised land of freedom, and the next generation for whom this fight is part of a somewhat boring ancient history in which they show little interest as they are busy with the very different task of settling down in this newly won land of freedom to the humdrum existence of daily living. Maybe things simply look so very different to them than to those who decry their lack of interest in a professional career because the person's desires are very different, depending on whether he still has to gain new freedoms or to learn to live successfully with them.

---

[2] Alice S. Rossi, "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," Daedalus (Spring, 1964).

Everett Hughes dealt with this problem in regard to ethnic relations in a recent article in which he compared the social aspirations of the French Canadian group with that of the American Negro. The French Canadians who have achieved full equality with their fellow citizens of the English speaking provinces do not wish to become part and parcel of the broader Canadian society, to disappear in it; on the contrary, a social and political battle is waged because of the French Canadians' wish to assert their difference and to make it secure. The American Negro who has not yet achieved equality wishes to become an integral part of the broader American society, with the exception of such splinter groups as the American Muslims; he does not wish to be different. One might wonder whether the Negroes will still feel this same way once they have achieved full equality, or whether then their position might not be more like that of the French Canadians of today. Certainly the Jewish group in the United States might serve as a case in point. Having fought for full social acceptance, motivated by the desire to become an integral part of the broader American scene, and having recently achieved this goal, we see lately Jewish efforts to secure a specific Jewish identity by, for example, preferring to live in predominently Jewish suburban communities.

Maybe some similar development is taking place in regard to the emancipation of women. As long as they did not possess equal rights with men they strove for them and felt disenfranchised because they did not possess them. Now when these disabilities of women are at least officially no longer in existence, maybe the equality they have striven for no longer seems so attractive, maybe not even suitable to their own deeper desires. Maybe what happened was that women never really wanted to be entirely equal with men in social and professional ways, maybe they simply did not want to be suffering from disabilities which prevented them from realizing their full female potentialities.

I recently returned from a study of the Israeli kibbutzim. They provide an instructive example of what may happen if social equality of women is construed as meaning equality with men in all occupational respects. The founders of the kibbutz movement were convinced that for women to achieve full self-realization they must be accepted in all respects the equals of men, particularly in regard to work, and no difference in the working arrangements should be permitted to encroach on this egality. And they arranged their lives accordingly. This was some thirty years ago. But when I visited the kibbutzim today I was struck by how - even much more than in contemporary American society - women are there filling mainly those occupational roles which even in the most traditional societies are considered as a women's "place." While during the early years of the kibbutzim there were no differences between the work assignments of men and women, today women in the kibbutz work at taking care of children, as teachers, as nurses, in the kitchen, the laundry, the sewing rooms, or as secretaries in the small industrial enterprises. And I was told these changes were brought about by the women's desires and not imposed by the wishes of men. If I found girls working at very hard physical labor, these were predominantly visiting European or American girls, not kibbutz members. I do not know for sure why this radical change has taken place in the occupational role of women in the kibbutz, but I was told that it came about when more and more women began to have children, and found that working like men was not as compatible with having children, as they had thought before the children were born. And this was though they had made elaborate arrangements for the communal rearing of their children. As time passes, working close to and with children seemed more attractive to most of these women than to work exactly as the men did. Such realization might have come easier to them because in the kibbutz life they were in no way socially, culturally or economically disadvantaged and because there men did not find it below their dignity to do what traditionally had been considered women's work, such as working in the kitchen or serving in the dining hall. Maybe certain rights and privileges seem extremely attractive only as long as one does not possess them, and then pale in one's estimation once one has achieved them.

What is involved in realizing one's full human potential depends very much also on the social realities of one's life, and much less so on absolutes. Thus as long as women are disabled, realizing their full potential must entail fighting against such disability; while such fight, and what goes with it, may seem pointless once the battle is won. Then it may be hard to understand why one had so keenly desired access to occupations that were closed at the time, which now that they are open are so obviously unattractive.

The scene in regard to women's occupational role is so confused today because for some this battle is a very present issue, for others it is old hat. Many girls grow up even today in settings that deny them equality in matters essential for their self-realization, hence their battle against such impediments extends even to issues in regard to which it later may turn out that to have access to them is immaterial, maybe even detrimental to gaining full self-realization as a woman. Hence there are still women in America today, and in our colleges, who wish to compete on entirely equal grounds with men in all social and occupational roles.

But more and more girls enter college who as children did not suffer from such disabilities in regard to those aspects of female life which count most. And they seem to opt in their majority for early marriage, rather than a completion of their professional education, and even for a suburban way of life. Why is this so? Does such life really open up to them the best chance for full self-realization as women? I doubt it; hence my problem; because would I not doubt it, there would be no problem.

I said initially that I believe it is immaterial how many professional women our society seems to need, how many industry, government, research and education is able and willing to absorb. The important problem is not how many of them can and do attain professional and occupational positions akin to those of men but what constitutes women's self-realization, their being able to achieve that which, according to one terminology, is called: full human integration, according to another: an autonomous personality, and in line with a third: achieving self-actualization, or: having access to peak experiences. But unfortunately all too much of the discussion of women's role in society concentrates on externals as how many women go to graduate school, to the detriment of our recognizing that the essential problem is self-realization.

Obviously no self-realization is possible unless man masters his two great tasks: firstly, self-preservation (and with it preservation of the existing members of the species) which includes in the modern world of ours also extending the scope of this technological mass society; and, secondly, the procreation of the species. Of these two tasks in historical times the first was more the domain of the male, the second of the female; though no full self-realization was possible for either sex unless it actively and meaningfully participated in both crucial tasks. Thus while man's first way of gaining self-realization was through work, he could not achieve it without his being a husband and father becoming central to his meaning of life. Women's main road to becoming an autonomous person was through being wife and mother, but unless she, too, could and did meaningfully participate in work for the preservation of the present generation and in extending the scope of life, her procreative achievement alone remained insufficient to give full meaning to her life; witness the tedium vitae, or the empty or frustrated existence of the typical Victorian middle class woman who, though fulfilling her procreative role, failed to develop into an autonomous person because she was excluded from participating fully in the work and social life of her world. The escape into literature and art which some of them sought failed to make up for what they missed, as it fails the male artist who is only creative, but not also procreative as husband and father. Obviously a mere being married or having fathered children will not do; his procreative tasks must become full of meaning for the male also to help him achieve his true self-realization. Though it is claimed that there may be some exceptions who may be able to get it alone, such as artists, discovers, etc., the psychological study of some of those who went it alone may cast doubt on whether this was really so.

The feminist movement, then, was healthy reaction against a Victorian ordering of society which prevented women from achieving self-realization by preventing her from taking her full role in society. And many a modern college educated girl's opting for the suburban existence is her natural defense against societies' trying to encroach on her desire first and foremost to concentrate on her main way toward self-realization: as wife and mother.

No concern with the fact that our society needs woman power, or bewailing that today women form a smaller proportion of the professional world than they did twenty years ago, is going to produce any significant change in this trend. On the other hand, we see that many a suburban wife and mother, once she has achieved that part of her self-realization that she can through her procreative function, feels a need to gain full autonomy as a person by adding to this achievement that of a woman contributing meaningfully to society. She then may continue her education, enter or re-enter a profession if she has the ability and strength to do so; and if she has not, she may settle uneasily and to the detriment of her autonomy for such much less rewarding enterprises as participation in community activities, as working for good causes, or even for simply living out her life as best she can, trying to fill a vaguely felt void through art and music. Though she will not return to the embroiders of her Victorian ancestor, gardening that may take its place signifies as little difference as the fact that in suburban life cocktail parties have taken the place of literary teas, or of the coffee Klatsch of the German counterpart of the Victorian lady.

The story would be different if we would so organize society and the conditions of work and professional education, that our girls would feel sure that fulfillment through marriage and procreation would not be endangered by their also pursuing that part of their self-realization in widening the meaning of social life. If they could be convinced of that, then the story might be a very different one; as we see it in some young married couples who both continue for example their professional education, though often at a different speed.

More about this later, because I first would like to reflect on how woman got into their Victorian predicament, which in reduced form was also that of her husband and children. Because no man can achieve his self-realization if in so doing he tries, or is more or less forced by the structure of his environment, to leave his wife, the mother of his children behind. If he does so, even his children will often fail to permit him to achieve the fulfillment of his true fatherhood. And the children who do not have a mother who lives a fully rewarding life suffer from it.

In a different context I discussed once before that it is erroneous to believe that the working mother is an invention of the modern age. On the contrary, the full-time wife and mother is a phenomenon that only modern technological development has made possible, a possibility as I hope I have by now made amply clear is not necessarily beneficial to her role as wife or mother in a deeper sense.[3] I referred there to the well-known fact that before the industrial revolution - with the exception of the numerically insignificant ruling groups - in all societies but those based on slavery, if the family wished to prosper, both man and woman had to participate actively in the economic process. The farmer's wife, as much as that of the small artisan or shopkeeper, was usually as fully involved in the economic and social activities of the family as was her husband. Before birth control the much more frequent pregnancies - short of sexual abstinence, or practices equally frustrating - certainly made woman more fully aware that she fulfilled her procreative role than do the few pregnancies of modern middle class woman. That in these older times women were worn out by these pregnancies as much as by the physical hardship of their economic activities is here beside the point; significant though it is that only technological advances (less physical hardship involved in production) and scientific progress (control of pregnancies) are what permit both man and woman of today to seek and find their autonomy and self-realization in ways they chose, rather than through those forced on them by necessity.

While the industrial revolution in many cases first increased the hardships of physical labor, and worsened its conditions, this was characteristic of a short transitional period only. But from its very beginning it removed the economic activities out of the family circle, separated ever more radically family life from workaday life, and in this way made the split between these two worlds possible, a split that did not exist even in slave societies. Without this split no Victorian woman was possible, no restriction of the female to the task of being wife and mother, and nothing much else. More important in the context that concerns us here, the industrial revolution soon made superfluous many of the main work activities of women and turned the rest of them over to men. Spinning and weaving, the making of clothing soon became relegated to factories, true partly run by women, but frequently by unmarried ones. Soon commercial laundries and shortly thereafter food processing plants such as bread factories and canning factories did away with other economic activities which had been for centuries

---

[3] "The Problem of Generations," Daedalus (Winter, 1962). "Growing Up Female," Harper's Magazine....

reserved for women. Modern plumbing, central heating, and what not else first eased and then did away with another segment of women's work. Thus in many ways the feminist movement was not just the result of technological progress easing women's labor and hence freeing her for other activities, nor was it that woman felt a desire for man's work, but men's jobs in factories did away with women's direct contribution to the economic process.

Nature not permitting a vacuum, most women did not settle down to doing much less than before. Energies that previously were devoted to significant contributions to the prosperity of the family were expended on other activities of less inherent meaning. It could be shown that modern women do not work less long hours than before, but chauffeuring one's children to parties or the dentist or even attending P.T.A. meetings is emotionally less rewarding than was securing the economic existence of the family in older times. Though it is less fatiguing physically, it is more frustrating emotionally. Being a full-time wife and mother is in and by itself neither sufficiently absorbing nor rewarding to fill out 15 or more years of a woman's life, unless she has a large number of children. As a consequence women often invest over heavily emotionally in their husbands and children. Doing so, they expect them to compensate for these emotional expenditures on them. But since husband and children have no parallel need to invest emotionally in wife and mother, they can not and do not wish to meet these demands, which often leads to emotional conflicts destructive to the well being of all.

This is why I do not believe that the solution suggested by some of dividing woman's life into three parts: before marriage, the time when the children grow up, and the period after they have reached adolescence, offers a solution to women's problems, though it might answer the need for additional labor, a need which soon might be a mute one since we seem unable to provide sufficient employment for all who seek it.

While self-realization at various times of ones life may require heavier investment in one or the other of the two main functions of man, I do not believe that it can be achieved if at any length of time the one or the other is entirely neglected. Maybe there is a parallel to this problem also in man's life. There has been much concern with how to occupy man's leisure time. This, too, I believe is an unsolvable problem because it implies a basically empty division of man's life because it is a division according to essentially insignificant principles, only in the males life not in line with age periods, but simply on the basis of whether or not one receives pay for certain activities. I am far from underestimating the importance of earning a living, but it is important only because it permits one (and one's family) to live one's life; which brings us back to the question out of what consists the importance of one's life. Since for most of us this question is no longer posed in religious terms we are back at the issue not what is work and what leisure, but what contributes to man's self-realization, and what does not. If the problem is thus posed, it will soon appear that the division into work and leisure time activities contain elements fostering and interferring with self-realization and the task is then clear: we must try to rectify these elements in both which do not contribute to our autonomy.

Posed in these terms, I believe it becomes clear why so many educated women prefer Nora's world to that of the suffragette: the first is at least clearly and positively connected with the specific female way to achieve self-realization, while the second has too many elements of a negative way to achieve it, namely through fighting for a chance to participate in the male way of self-realization. But a doll's house is no home for man, woman or children. Self-realization cannot be achieved through an addition of disparate elements to each other, but only through their true integration in ways which are germane to one's sex and particular personality and life history. As much as the doll house existence prevents woman from gaining autonomy because it secludes her from participation in the broader world of society, it interferes with the man's autonomy because it does not provide a setting where he can in his manly way find fulfillment also through his being a husband and father. That its all too restricted setting interferes with children gaining their autonomy goes without saying. All this is obvious, and certainly so to this group.

So why do many women select this existence? I believe because they recognize that, restricting and stunting as such a life is, it comes closer for them to finding self-realization as women than they would by competing with man in the work-a-day world as it is presently organized. This world as it now exists hardly permits self-realization for man, but it does so even much less for woman.

What is needed, I believe, is not sex equality in work and home, as some advocate, not participation by women on an equal basis in activities which are considered masculine, but the creation of work and working conditions which permit women at least as much self-realization in the social and work sphere of life as are presently available to men, and do so in line with women's natural inclinations, talents, physiological and psychological make up which, after all, is different from that of man.

What is wrong is that today women are expected to enter man's working world, so to say as men, while they have all too little chance to enter as women a working world which is at least as organized for working women as it is organized on the basis of the requirements of the machines, or technology, or a science the requirements of which are viewed as independent from the inner needs of the man and woman who work at them. And since most of these machines were invented by men, work around them is more organized in line with men's working needs than women's, though they are little in accord with even men's human requirements.

That this is so is obscured, because there are always a few women who seek and some who manage to find their personal self-realization by proving to themselves and others that they can beat men at their own game; as I suspect that there are some men who try to find their self-realization by making women's way their own. But this works only for few, and even for them usually only at a price.

How then would have our world to be reorganized to permit self-realization to both men and women, and particularly to women?

I alluded before to the fact that it was the split between the world in which one lives and that in which one works that led to the removal of women's work from the broader social and economic activities of men. It not only cut women off from this wider world, it also cut man from the world of woman, at great emotional loss to him, but this is not here my problem and I shall, therefore, not pursue it further.

I also remarked how the women in the kibbutzim who initially insisted on working exactly like men and felt that was required for their achieving self-realization, within a relatively short span of time changed their mind on this issue and became convinced that what is necessary is not that they work like men, but only that the work contribution they make in their sphere should be as significant to the well being of the society they live in as that of the men. I believe that this realization came about because kibbutz life did away with this split in the world of the home and the world of work. In the kibbutz women could give up the desire to work like men, because there the work of men and women proceeds in such proximity, women are so intimately part of the men's work, and men of women's work, that the split I have spoken about does not exist. With it neither women nor men feel that they lose out in participation in the way the other sex achieves its self-realization through work which is germane to its psychology and physiology.

Thus a most important first step to permit both men and women to find more satisfaction in their own life, and their lives with each other, would be to organize society so that this split can be undone. I cannot go into the technological requirements and the economic adjustments which such change would require. It certainly would require a loosening up of the workday - as it does in the kibbutz where despite intensive work men and women manage to visit each other's place of work, participate sufficiently in it to know what it is all about, what its hardships and rewards are, to be able to intelligently emphathize with each other's work.

It also would probably require a families' living much closer to their working place, both the working place of men and women. In this respect some progress has been made as some offices, and even factories, are being located in suburban areas where the people live who work in them. But I believe that this is, at best, a small beginning. I think a much more important step would be to rebuild our cities to make city life again more attractive as a place where to raise a family. The move to the suburbs will not be stopped, as the choice of such life by so many of our college educated girls demonstrates, by requests that they should pursue a career. As long as pursuing a career conflicts with raising children in surroundings which are attractive to do so, for most women what is good for their children will win out over their careers. Making living in the cities more attractive will not only mean better housing, but certainly also better schools, and schools which are not torn asunder by racial strife.

With these remarks I have come to what I consider the essential problem confronting all women, including college educated ones: the lack of social arrangements facilitating their pursuing a career without they or their children having to pay too high a price for doing so. Maybe I could illustrate what is needed through an example with which I am intimately familiar. My wife works with children, though at a quite different occupation than mine. Still, that our lifework has so much in common provides a bond of common interests, understanding and from the distance even of participation in each other's work; while our work spheres are different enough that we do not feel by exchanging experiences we simply continue what we are already doing all day at work. So far so good. But after her leave because of pregnancy and after our first child was born the social agency where she was employed transfered her to a distant district, a change the professional woman heading the agency was unwilling to rectify, though another office of this agency was located close to our home. In conflict between the needs of her child and the requirements of her work, there was no doubt in this mother's mind what she had to do: quit working. Fortunately she could secure equally attractive and meaningful work with another children's agency located within easy walking distance from our home which she accepted because it permitted her frequently to come home at lunchtime, and to arrange her working hours so that by working less than full time she could be home early enough to be with her children.

That such arrangements can be made relatively rarely, and that even women in charge of social agencies are unwilling to make such arrangements for working mothers, suggest that in our education of professional women we think only, or all too much, of the profession, and hardly at all that they are women.

Maybe here for a last time I might refer to the kibbutz. These are agricultural settlements in a poor country devoid of natural resources, in a new nation which is struggling against heaviest odds to establish itself. There it was found possible to have mothers of infants work only a four hours' day and to increase it slowly first to six and only finally to eight; and these mothers live in a setting where they need no time at all to expend on traveling from and to work, or on shopping or other errands, and their children are taken care of during the day by special caretakers. If this is possible in one of the poorest countries, the richest country in the world should be able to make at least equally generous arrangements for its working mothers.

But to do so we must start out with the realization that they are first and foremost mothers, and not workers. In our thinking on working mothers the attitude seems to be that it is their motherhood that somehow must be fitted into their life as worker. The kibbutz started out to think this way, but they soon learned that the thinking must go the other way around. Because in most of our settings the attitude is, both during graduate study and then at work, that their motherhood must somehow be made to fit into the requirements of graduate study, or work, many college educated women knowing that this runs counter to their natural desires, fail to find ways how their work could be fitted into their prime concern with their motherhood. Well-intentioned efforts to encourage women to return to finish their education, or return to work after their children are fairly grown up, fails to meet the issue, because it starts out with the assumption that the two, work and motherhood, are not really compatible. And they are not, unless work is so arranged that motherhood does not suffer from it.

This would, as a minimum, require: shorter working hours for mothers of young children, work close to their home, excellent professional care for their children during the first four and later six hours these women spend at work away from home, ready availability of the mother to her children in cases of emergency, etc.

Of course our communal life will have also to be reorganized if we want to make it possible that women are to be working wives and mothers. If we are serious in considering occupations and professions part of woman's life, we cannot expect her to actively participate in many voluntary associations, such as P.T.A. meetings and other community affairs which now occupy so much of the day of the non-working mother. We cannot continue to tell women that these activities are very important and that they must engage in them, and expect them to work and be mothers and wives at the same time. It is accepted that the man's work-a-day life occupies him to such degree that he has little free time for such after work activities. At least the same must be true for women, if not more so. And if then much of the work done by these voluntary and charitable organizations will be professionalized, this will only improve the contributions of these organizations to society while at the same time opening up new occupational opportunities for women.

Unless we at the college and graduate school level arrange the training of married girls along these lines, making it not only possible but attractive for them to go to school at hours and a rate of progress that does not interfere with their wifely and motherly concerns, they will not believe our claim that we want them to be mothers and professional workers at the same time, nor will society at large be ready to make the appropriate arrangements I suggested if we in our universities do not show the way.

Women, most women, want to participate in the world's broader life, each in terms of her interests, talents, education; the educated woman wishes to do so in line with her special training. But unfortunately for the future generations, the vast majority wishes to do so only in ways which will not endanger their self-realization as wives and mothers. I believe that their shunning of certain careers such as medicine and physics, which I mentioned before, is due to their realization that at this moment on the American professional scene these are not professions which lend themselves to the desired combination of work and motherhood. Interestingly enough, it was the writings of some professional women, such as psychiatrists, which stressed motherhood to the exclusion of a professional life, in contradistinction to the life these authors had chosen - which added to the confusion about the possibility of combining the two.

In contrast to the low percentage of women entering or planning to enter physics or business administration, a little more women than men percentage wise planned to study the humanities, and women predominated in education (59%), social work (68%) and even more so in the health field such as nursing, physical and occupational therapy, etc., (altogether 78%). Instead of drawing the obvious conclusions that these are occupations attractive to women because they are women, and because they permit pursuing these careers without this interfering too much with finding fulfillment as wife and mother, some spokesmen, or maybe I should say spokesladies, draw from this fact the conclusions that this trend should be combatted. For example, we are told that such selection is not due to natural inclinations or the greater likelihood that these professions can be better combined with marriage and motherhood, but that such choices are due to "sex-role stereotypes" and that "the elementary school system" should "eradicate these stereotypes and help instead in the development of a more androgynous conception of sex role."[4] Can we blame our college girls that they prefer a suburban existence to a hermaphroditic one? If these are the choices, is not the first the healthier one?

Now few will go so far as to advocate the androgynous solution, but the practices of our colleges and graduate schools is such as if they would subscribe to such opinion, though consciously and in theory they would abhor it. But the way the curricula of our schools are organized, and the way employment is organized in places of work, suggests that the basic philosophy seems to be that the working person is without sex, or that his sex must not be taken into consideration in planning profession or work life. This, as I have tried to suggest, is bad for males, but since pregnancy is not part of their physiological make up, and child care is much less part of their psychological need, than it is of women, they suffer less from such neglect of the essential nature of man.

While college and graduate education at least permits the male to believe that through pursuing his study he can attain fuller self-realization as man, they do not do the same for women. This, then is the first task in reshaping education for women; a clear recognition which occupations and professions, because of their very nature, are more suitable for them, and which others are more suitable because of the way work is or can be arranged in them at the moment.

I would strongly suggest that our departments of sociology, economics, planning, etc., pay serious attention to the pressing problem how society and particular the occupations must be reshaped, and the social arrangements for the care of children be improved, so that women must give up neither seeking self-realization through participation in the world at large, nor through being wives and mothers. Most of all, they must relinquish an underlying attitude that to be able to take her place in society, women must accept an androgynous role.

In this connection the fact that the service occupations and professions such as psychology, social work, education, occupy an ever larger segment of the working population when

---

[4] Rossi, loc. cit., p. 639.

compared with for example factory work, seems to point the way. I believe that these are occupations eminently suitable for women, though there will always be some exceptions, such as women Nobel prize-winners in physics or medicine. But they do not concern us here, as little as the fact that there always will be males who, for one reason or other, are more suitable for engaging in those occupations which seem to come natural to women.

I think there is some truth that certain stereotyped images should undergo a change. This change should not be that our primers begin to show women truckdrivers or riveters, but rather, for example, that the profession of social work, so much needed because of the inequities of our society, is depicted as equally meritorious as that of physician. The issue is not that all occupations should be depicted as androgynous , but that the occupations which seem attractive to women must be depicted as socially as important as those different ones which seem genuinely more suitable for males.

Most of all we must stop depicting as the sole task of females to be wives and mothers. But to achieve that, maybe some of our psychologists and psychiatrists - and those sociologists, anthropologists and other social scientists which seem over-impressed by what they say - must free themselves from viewing Victorian women - cut off from the world at large and hence in desperation trying to fill the void by overconcentration on motherhood - as the ideal female type, and as the only mother who does not cheat her children out of motherlove.

THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEMPORARY LITERARY CULTURE ON THE GIFTED COLLEGE WOMAN

by

Diana Trilling

In undertaking to speak to you this evening on the influence of our contemporary literary culture on the gifted young college woman, I realize, of course, that I have moved rather far afield from the precise area this conference has set itself to explore. You have come together for these few days to deal with honors programs and with the peculiar educational problems of superior women students - and I have chosen to talk to you about literature. I hope, however, that I am not being unduly confident in giving you my assurance that my subject is considerably more relevant to the theme of your meetings than it may appear to be on the surface. Last night we heard Dr. Bettleheim discuss some of the social-psychological realities affecting the life of women in present-day American life - the impulse, for instance, of young women, in a situation which doesn't permit them the special considerations of their sex, to give up the careers for which they were trained rather than give up their role as mothers. The source of Dr. Bettleheim's observations was, I gather, twofold - social studies and his and our practical experience of the world in which we live. But art, too, has something to tell us about the contemporary experience - and something nonetheless cogent because it is intuitive rather than scientific and because it may at many points contradict our own social perceptions or those of the professions devoted to formal social study. In The Two Cultures C. P. Snow describes the large separation which he believes now exists between science and the humanities. I also have it in mind this evening to speak of two cultures, but in a very different sense than Sir Charles's. The opposition with which I shall be dealing here is not the division between science and the humanities but the extraordinary antithesis between the view of life to which we subscribe as teachers, university administrators, counselors of students, even as citizens or parents - participants, that is, in the on-going enterprise of society - and the view of life now being proposed in our literary culture.

Although usually, in the past, when the literary critic spoke of literary culture, he meant a quite limited phenomenon - the activity of the most conscious segment of society as it deals with books - a premise of my remarks tonight is that this strict definition no longer applies. Parallel to the social and economic mobilities of which sociology has taken account, there is another movement in American life which has not been sufficiently studied - the cultural mobility which accompanies the breakdown of the old barriers of class. While note has been taken of the diffusion of standards of domestic taste through large sections of the American population, this development has been chiefly examined in its relation to the impact of advertising and merchandising on people who suddenly have enough money to acquire the questionable benefits of a consumer culture. What has not been properly commented upon is the diffusion of tastes, ideas and attitudes whose ultimate source is not Madison Avenue but art - and art at its top reaches of seriousness, where Madison Avenue is the declared enemy.

Up to a short time ago, it was perfectly accurate to speak of American literary culture in terms of a highbrow and a lowbrow culture, a literature for the elite and a literature for mass consumption; I think, however, that that time is now past. I am not implying that we have achieved the total democratization of literature, and that thereis no longer any distinction to be made among many levels of literary performance and audience. But the unbridgeable gaps which once divided the various sectors of American literary production and response are closing. In another context, I referred recently to the information given me a few years ago by the editor of a semi-popular periodical - that there had been a moment, in the '50's, when the smooth-paper magazines were faced with a major decision, either to lower their denominators and aim for a truly popular readership, or, as she put it, raid Partisan Review. The magazines that lowered their standards suffered a fall in circulation. The magazines that stormed the bastions of high culture rose in circulation.

We are all of us familiar with this particular aspect of the diffusion of literary culture. It is not only that magazines as different in their intention, and diversified in their appeal, as - say - Esquire, Show, Holiday, Mademoiselle, Redbook, Good Housekeeping, even Nugget or Playboy now make their way by offering the work - not always the best or most serious work, but something of the vision of life which imbues the work -

of some of our most "advanced" writers. It is not only that our serious authors can now, if they wish, reach very wide audiences, or that our popular or semi-popular magazines are staffed by men and women for whom it is a qualification for their jobs that they have a ready familiarity with the best writing being produced here and abroad. After all, it could be pointed out that even several decades ago F. Scott Fitzgerald published in the Saturday Evening Post and Ernest Hemingway in Cosmopolitan. The more important fact is that writers of the greatest adventurousness of mind are now being sought out by the large-circulation periodicals in a clear programatic effort to validate the social and moral worth of these magazines. And more important still is that fact that even where our advanced writers may not themselves appear, their attitudes and their forms of sensibility have penetrated to such an extent that we no longer even notice it as an intrusion.

But this is only one route by which the dissemination of contemporary literary values is proceeding. In addition to the magazines, there are the theatre, movies, television, in all of which, no matter how wide the audience they hope to reach, we see the mark of literary modernity as it is now being formulated on the advanced cultural fronts. That the intention of the serious artist has been often grievously diluted or distorted in this process of popularization goes, of course, without saying. The line of descent is nevertheless unmistakable.

It follows, then, that the college student of today does not have to be especially "literary" to be influenced by contemporary literary thought. Nor does the sex of the student either increase or decrease this susceptibility, so far as I can make out. Male or female, gifted or only average in endowment, any student who is part of the present-day world is also part of the world that is being reflected in, and created by, contemporary literary art. I know, of course, that it is one of the assumptions of education that a well-trained mind is better capable of resisting influence than an untrained mind. It is my own opinion that this assumption is largely a piety - it all depends upon the nature of the influence; it has been my observation that the influences from the side of rebelliousness, whether in art or politics, are as compelling among the well-educated classes as those of conservatism are in other sections of the community. Perhaps what marks the person of superior intellectual gift in our society is not so much his capacity to think for himself as his sense of autonomy. But this sense of autonomy can be false - no one is proof against the pressures of his peer group. It is therefore to some purpose, I think, that if we are to deal with the special problems of the superior young woman in our colleges, we also try to understand her in her unspecialness - through an understanding of what it is she is now being told about herself and her relation to society in the novels she reads, the plays and movies and television programs she sees, even perhaps by the pictures in the fashion magazines she leafs through at the beauty parlor. For this is the other education to which she is being exposed along with her schooling, and it may be even more persuasive.

Confronting such a huge area of investigation, one must necessarily narrow the range. I can suppose it would be possible to treat this evening's subject by limiting oneself, say, just to the image of contemporary young womanhood in a magazine like *Mademoiselle*; in fact, just to the fashion models who display the clothes and cosmetics in magazines for young woman - those extraordinary creatures whose harsh hard outlines are presented to us as, presumably, the very distillation of female charm; whose angularity of figure and posture are, purportedly, the sign of their womanly grace; whose fierce air of wonder and question is, paradoxically enough, the key to their knowingness. Surely none but an affluent society could afford to represent its well-being in girls as underweight as these; it is very expensive to stay this thin and yet sufficiently strong to achieve the bizarre poses which celebrate the freedom and despair of the contemporary young. It also takes much knowledge of the racial unconscious to project, in the handling of one's body, Dostoievski's remarkable insight that there is no such thing as an ugly woman. But although there is undoubtedly much to be said of the of the relationship between today's fashion model and the view of life that is current in our elite literary quarterlies, I'll resist the urge to explore it further and, instead, take my point of departure in television, by recounting a story I chanced upon one evening not long ago in a series called *The Nurses*. The program was designed, I gather, to challenge the hegemony of the male doctors, but, strangely, the male characters have a way of taking over the center of the stage.

The episode, on the evening I tuned in, concerned a young intern recently married to a nurse in the hospital. The young man is accused of having cheated on his examinations in his last year of medical school; he is brought up on charges before the hospital board of inquiry. Although he swears, publicly, that he is innocent, the young doctor admits to his wife that he is lying: he did cheat on his examinations but for what he considers a sound reason - although he was a good student, he was not top of his class and he had to lead his class if he wanted an appointment to this hospital where he could work with one of the foremost endocrinologists of the country. His wife is horrified and confounded: she, too, is to be called up before the board; shall she also perjure herself to protect her husband? The young man has no doubt but that this is where her duty lies, and not only her duty but common sense - after all, is it not motive that counts, rather than honor in the abstract? And in this view, he has the support of the great endocrinologist himself, who argues that the young intern's superior talent for medicine is really all that matters; what difference does it make that he got his hospital post dishonestly since he has turned out to be so worthy of the appointment? In fact, the only people in the story who share the moral scruples of the young wife are the hospital administrators; and of these we were told in an earlier episode of the serial that they are not only squares but hypocrites: they are interested, not in the patients in the hospital, but in the rich donors - and they don't pay their kitchen staff a living wage. Well, the wife fails to persuade her husband to confess the truth or even to feel guilty about his lie, so she leaves him. But her inviolate morality turns out to be the loneliest of virtues - gift, imagination, charm, humor, flexibility, even conscience itself are on the side of the intern. As the door closes on her departure, at the end of the film, we have the firm impression that a talented young doctor is well rid of a partner so lacking in realism. Our hero will now no doubt find himself a wife who understands that it is sometimes necessary to discard the traditional moralities for the sake of one's ultimate goal.

Now a story of this kind was obviously designed for what we think of as a popular audience. It is apparent, however, that it has its cultural antecedents far from the advertising office in which it was dreamed up, perhaps with some degree of conscious cynicism. First of all, there is its implicit political reference. Ever since the McCarthy period, when writers for movies and television lost their jobs for political reasons, it has been one of the tokens of conscience and seriousness in Hollywood or on Madison Avenue to introduce into their popular films this or that bit of social propaganda: one's duty to resist an investigating committee is one of the familiar messages from this quarter of political enlightenment. Then there is the relation the story establishes between gift and moral independence: were the young man in the story less talented as a doctor, we can suppose he'd not have earned the right to make his own moral laws. A similar assumption, of course, underlies some of our best writing of the last 75 years - ever since Rimbaud, Beaudelaire, Dostoievski (we recall), the hero of literature has been conceived as someone whose special endowment of sensitivity or imagination or spirit puts him beyond the reach of ordinary moral imperatives. It is a point of view which reaches its present-day climax in Mailer's Hipster, Genet's criminal, even in James Baldwin's Negro. And one of its corollaries is the special virtue which is now assigned to sexual deviation, as if a deviant sexuality is itself a sign of superiority, like a talent for painting or poetry: the homosexual in current literature is exempt, not merely from the sexual rules of our society, but from its prescriptions for moral behavior. Or another offshoot of the same premise is our assumption that the intellectual has the inherent right to civil disobedience - it is a right, we note, that we do not grant to the business man or the reactionary politician.

But the connection between our TV story and present-day literary culture in its more advanced sectors doesn't stop here. We recall that in the literature of 40 years ago, the conflict in the life of a young doctor named Martin Arrowsmith concerned his choice between pure and impure science - that is, between research and the practice of medicine. Basic to the choice with which Sinclair Lewis confronted his hero was the problem of financial security. In our story, idealism and financial security are no longer in opposition to each other. Apparently the Foundations - or if not the Foundations, then a burgeoning economy - have taken care of that drama. In fact, money is not mentioned at all in our film - and this is not an accidental or minor omission. It indicates far more than merely our current economic upsurge.

Of the many conditions by which society asserts its reality, none is more forceful than the making and spending of money. Therefore to make money real is to make society real. But this reality is exactly what contemporary literature would not put under question. According to advanced literary opinion, society does indeed have power - a giant, implacable power to destroy the individual. It also has weight - dread and inchoate. What it does not have is such concreteness, structure, particularization of good and bad purpose, as once gave the individual his best means of self-definition and the novelist his richest material. The reason money has disappeared from fiction is because society has disappeared from fiction.

Indeed, I think it would be fair to say that is we had to name one test by which we can now distinguish between writing which is artistically ambitious and other, unserious writing, it would be the amount of reality given to the social organization. The more art in any literary work, the less social reality - the less allusion, that is, to money, class, manners, property, profession. There are a few television programs - Route 66 is an outstanding example - which aping their betters in this as in other ways, base their claim to art precisely on their abstractness. For the most part, however, television and the movies still lag in this direction. Although the story I have recounted, for instance, avoids the problem of money, in other ways it continues to defer to the old popular preference for social representation: it provides its main characters with a local habitation and with professions. Nevertheless the professions, being nothing if not social particularizations, vanish from a fiction which means to deal acutely and consciously with the modern condition. Especially they disappear from that branch of fiction which is most highly subjective in inspiration, the developmental novel whose material is the coming of age of a young man.

In the past the hero of the developmental novel was always either a writer, like his author, or some surrogate for the writer - a painter, perhaps, or a lawyer, an architect, in extremity a doctor or scientist. Today, these professional surrogates for the writer are more and more being substituted for by totally amorphous projections of the author, persons without roots, social delineation or educational advantage - a baseball player as in Bernard Malamud's The Natural, an ex-basketball player as in John Updike's Rabbit, Run, a man of - what? - some unspecified universal genius such as Salinger's Zooey Glass. And it is interesting that where, as in Malamud's more recent book, A New Life, or Updike's more recent The Centaur, the protagonists are given professions consonant with the experience of their authors, the jobs they do are robbed of their traditional coherence. In A New Life, although the hero is technically a college instructor in English, he is presented to us not merely as an unusually depressed figure but as a displaced person, a born Easterner dropped without passport in the wastes of the far West; also as an ex-alcoholic, which further authenticates him as a man without a context. In Updike's The Centaur, the leading character is similarly a teacher, in a high school; but he spends every other chapter in the novel as a centaur, Chiron, teacher to Achilles: the point being, I suppose, that the profession of teacher in our society is half-mythological. Which, of course, it may very well be.

In serious contemporary fiction, the interest which once attached to the social scene now attaches to the self. The hero's exploration of his world has yielded to the effort of self-exploration and -explanation. And here, again, our television story reveals its high antecedents - only that is right for our young intern which makes him feel right, feel "good" (as the current phrase has it) within himself. The idea of personal or social morality as a more or less fixed code which guides the conduct of people living together in the community of a nation cedes to the idea of morality as an entirely ad hoc affair, something we devise for ourselves according to our subjective needs of the moment.

And yet the subjective moral test is not as anarchic as it may sound when we examine it outside its usual narrative frame. We remember that in our television story the young intern who cheated and lied was not planning to be a gangster; he was going to be one of the great doctors of the future. That which was good for him, in other words, was also good for us, for the future of mankind: certainly we need more gifted endocrinologists. This is the familiar basis of moral judgment in most of our serious contemporary writing. The hero, with or without profession, is the voice of the author-artist. His need, his choices, are actually our needs and our proper choices too, had we but the wit to recognize them.

The difference between anarchy and virtue is consciousness - the ability to name the problem whose solution requires an act of moral improvisation. Whoever is aware that modern society is not designed for the best uses of man has, as it were, a built-in guaranty that his own moral decisions are the best ones, however wrong they may seem by traditional standards. Consciousness is ultimate conscience. Indeed, I cannot overemphasize the degree to which, in the modern literary view, a proper awareness of self is equated with social morality. The view has perhaps its most arresting statement in the recent work of James Baldwin. For Baldwin - I put it crudely - his own sensibility, with all that this implies of his own distinctive gift and personality, is extended to represent the sensibility of the whole Negro population. A race which has been brought to its present plight by a vast complex of economic, social and psychological forces is shorn of these real conditions of its dilemma and becomes the object of one individual Negro artist's passionate quest for self-definition and self-justification.

As an artist, Baldwin is not a Negro, anymore than a young Jewish writer like Philip Roth - say - is a Jew. If there are no significant distinctions of class in our contemporary literature, neither are there valid distinctions of race or creed. The multiplicities of cultures within the American group, once so absorbing to the novelist, are now no more than a tease of the memory - what divides the black and the white characters in Baldwin's Another Country is not their differing human characteristics but only Baldwin's undemonstrated assertion that there is a human and characteristic difference. (I have not yet seen his new play but I gather that what divides black and white there is something more substantial, the hatred of the whites with which Baldwin endows all his Negro characters.) I could not recognize the girl's family in Philip Roth's Goodbye, Columbus as Jews.

It is to self-knowledge, self-awareness, self-validation that the consciousness of the modern writer and hero is directed. The selfhood of others exists, but without exciting any actual feelings of connection. Passion we reserve for ourselves. To others we bring that modern substitute for passion - understanding. This is of course one of the techniques for living that we have been being taught in our nursery schools for some years now. We must learn, not to feel for each other, but to understand each other. Thus does the young ego defend itself, and grow. It is also the method of conducting our foreign relations which, over the last decades, has so largely substituted for a clear, principled foreign policy: we have only to understand our enemies - understand, that is, that they are no less human than ourselves - to eradicate our hostilities. In television, understanding is what keeps the dramatic wheels moving. The more we are told about both sides of any issue, the higher the quality of the program. (cf The Defenders) Conflict may or may not be resolved. Usually it is not. But at least everyone has been given a big therapeutic dose of tolerance of other peoples' points of view and of insight into their motives.

But understanding, after all, is sometimes rather cold potatoes. If another boy on the street snatches my son's wallet, it is all very well to tell my son that the other boy probably comes from a broken home and that the reason he steals is because nobody loves him. This explanation will no doubt make my son feel very enlightened, and superior to his underprivileged neighbor; but it scarcely takes account of his natural indignation at having been assaulted. Where, in the midst of all our insight, is feeling? At the end of our television story, when the wife tells her husband she has decided to leave him, the husband says, "But I love you." The door closes behind the wife. The telephone rings and the young doctor moves firmly to answer it, a smile - a wan smile, to be sure - of anticipation on his face. Yes, it is the great endocrinologist calling him to his office; everything is going to be all right. So much for feeling, and it makes the rather quiet scene of Nora's departure from the Doll's House sound like a full orchestration of expressed emotion. One gropes back over the ages to a novel, Farewell to Arms, in which the loss of a wife spelled the defeat of all of life and hope for the hero, and one wonders how many light-years now separate us from our world of 35 years ago, a world - or so, at least, our fiction told us - in which people who loved each other gave hostage to more than fortune, to one another. Today - again, if we are to judge by our fiction - the individual is not only isolated from everyone he knows, even his own love partner. The connection between people, which we once so much relied upon, breaks, or, at best, is diverted from its former channels, and man lives alone in marriage, in friendship, in non-business, in business, in every area with which the contemporary imagination concerns itself. Only where our literary arts are themselves frankly retrograde - as, say, in conventional war stories; for what could be more retrograde than old-fashioned war? - do we find any celebration of the retrograde emotions of comradeship, mutuality, self-sacrifice for the sake of another; or, for that matter, any acknowledgment of a reciprocal relationship between love or anger, on the one hand, and that which we love or hate, on the other. The typically modern hero talks a great deal about love and anger; in fact, about all his feelings - the English language is put under some strain to cope with the volcanic surge of the contemporary internal being. But it is with difficulty that one discovers the specific human object of so much emotional urgency, unless it be the writer himself.

And it is especially in the relationship between lovers that emotional isolation is the order of our literary day. If we think of Hemingway as the last writer to give us love stories, we realize that he was also the last significant writer to engage in anything like an equal dialogue with society; we begin to realize, that is, that where there is no dialogue between society and the individual, there can be very little dialogue between individuals - which is of course exactly what the writer since Hemingway has been trying to tell us. Instead of the dialogue between man and society of Hemingway's best work, we now have the interior monologue of fiction, man talking to himself - with no certainty that he is even being listened to. In A Farewell to Arms, Lt. Henry was on a quest for personal identity; but he sought it and found it, though only temporarily, in his love for Catherine Barclay. In For Whom the Bell Tolls, the dedication of Jordan, Hemingway's hero, to the cause of the Spanish loyalists had its paridigm in his intensity of feeling for the girl, Maria. But both such efforts have now met the defeat foretold for them by the unhappy endings of these books; we can measure the distance between the fiction of World War I and II by examining even the first, and quite traditional, novel of Norman Mailer, whose name has since become synonymous with the moral revolution of our times. For in Mailer's war novel, The Naked and the Dead, published in 1948,the Army is not simply one compartment within the social entity. It is society itself, in all its giant malign indifference to the human destiny. And within the senseless world of the Army, there is room for neither loyalty nor affection nor yet ordinary concern for one's fellow-creatures, let alone love. The emotions of Hemingway's war are more than inappropriate in Mailer's war, they are downright dangerous; they can get you killed. There are no women in The Naked and the Dead except as off-stage noises, the distant rumble of remembered sexual excitement.

Between the publication of The Naked and the Dead and the appearance of a story of Mailer's called "Time of Her Time," some twelve years elapsed. The content of the recent story was nevertheless implicit in Mailer's war novel, where woman existed only in the phantasy of the male characters. For concrete as it is in its physical detail, "Time of Her Time" has its greatest reality as the expression of the male castration phantasy. It is a story about the sexual relations of a young bullfighter in Greenwich Village - I don't think that qualifies as a profession - and a young woman from New York University. The young woman is determined not to allow her partner the pleasure of giving her sexual satisfaction. The young man, challenged, inflicts this beneficence upon the girl despite her resistance, by resorting to methods of love-making which, because they violate social sanction, dispel her self-protections. But the girl, far from being softened by her experience, solidifies in hostility; the story ends with its heroine bitterly accusing its hero of being a homosexual. Manifestly, this is not a love story. It is not even the story of an "affair" in the sense of suggesting, as an affair once did, some degree of continuity and romance. It is a story of personal war, in which the ugliness of the Army now becomes the ugliness of woman. In The Naked and the Dead, we recall, the Army stood for all of the destructiveness of society. Now it is woman who incorporates all the destructiveness of the social organization. The castrating woman is surely not new in literature any more than the male phantasy of the castrating woman is new in life. But what Mailer's story demonstrates better than any piece of contemporary fiction I can bring to mind is the new impulse of the writer to identify the destructive female force with the destructive social force: woman is society in all its dark, unspecifiable power and horror. The sexual battle between the male and female characters in "Time of Her Time" is more than the projection of a common male castration phantasy, although it is certainly that too. Looked at more broadly, in the context of the modern writer's disgust with civilization - and we remember that it is Mailer's announced program, as, in a different way, it was D. H. Lawrence's before him to work a renovation in our consciousness, in order to bring us closer to our life of instinct - "Time of Her Time" represents the doomed, last-ditch struggle of man to preserve his selfhood, his decent manly pride, under the assaults of civilization. The distance Mailer has moved from Lawrence can be measured by the fact that for Mailer, unlike Lawrence, civilization cannot be redeemed even by a reversion to primitivism: his hero tries it and fails.

The woman in advanced present-day fiction, in short, is no longer recognizably related to the ball and chain of American folklore - that goddess knocked off the pedestal of romantic courtship to become a wife who saddles her poor husband with a home whose mortgage he cannot meet, with children who squabble and brawl, with a furnace to stoke and a lawn to mow. Feminism and technology have changed the wife from an over-dependent scold and shrew to someone who is man's equal, even his superior, in the ability to meet the requirements of daily living. Woman has now become something far more insidious than a mere nag; she has become that force in life which not only has its own unconquerable and even indefinable power but also operates to rob man of his last shred of power and dignity. Sexually, she is all hunger and depredation. In terms other than those of sexual desire, she is an empty shell - as empty and meaningless as the society in which we find her and with which she has come to be so disastrously identified.

And how is man to cope with society, so-to-speak right in his own bed, except by isolating himself from it - her - and ridding himself of his root emotional tie to her? Except by treating her like an abstraction, just as he treats society as an abstraction? We observed the vital separation of the young intern and his wife in our television story. But this is only a shadow version of the chasm that yawns between the men and women in today's more serious and ambitious fiction. There is Philip Roth's Goodbye, Columbus, for example, in which the young lovers have their most brilliant meeting at the bottom of a swimming pool, where the contact can be sustained only the length of one deep intake of breath and is dissolved and made unreal by the dark moving water in which it takes place. Or there is Updike's Rabbit, Run, where the hero's skill as a high school athlete is recapitulated, in manhood, in the swiftness with which he makes his constant escapes from the women with thom he has will-lessly involved himself, escapes which require no causal explanation other than resides in a man's natural right to free himself from a death-trap. More overtly, there is the incapacity of the hero of Malamud's A New Life to control his own sexual fate - of the three sexual encounters in Malamud's much-praised novel, in the first the connection is irremediably broken by a farcical incident; in the second, a snowstorm, a recalcitrant car and an over-eager young lady conspire to thwart the promise of romance; in the third, the very availability of the much-desired woman is enough to transform the dream of love into a reality of dreariness and despair. Or there is Golding's great best-seller, Lord of the Flies, as appealing to young people today as Salinger's Catcher in the Rye to a previous generation, in which there are finally no women at all to impose the dictates of civilization, and man is alone, in the infancy of the race and in all his grim submission to natural instinct. Surely it was no more personal whimsy that impelled Nabokov, in Lolita, to write the love story of a grown man and a child. Only in perversity, only in the violation of social law, is passion between the sexes now possible to the literary imagination - it is worth noting that tenderness in present-day fiction is more often found in the homosexual than in the heterosexual relation; Genet's censored film of prison life is an example.

What we have, then, is a literary culture - if it is only a literary culture - in which man lives in isolation from his society and in which his society re-announces itself in woman; in which, that is, woman is in essence either a predator or a husk, an uninhabited body supplied with the mechanical appurtenances for the satisfaction of the sexual appetites and the continuation of the unhappy human kind. At any rate, such is the situation as it exists for the male writer. And what about the woman writer? Does she subscribe to a similar view of society and herself?

This question is not easy to answer, and not merely for reasons of my own possible sexual chauvinism but because there is more cultural contradiction and paradox in female than in male fiction. Being neither the pathfinders of culture nor its creative historians, women always tend to represent the principle of conservatism as opposed to the greater adventurousness of the male - it was the observation Freud made about our differing sexual roles even at the beginnings of civilization. Much female writing, indeed, constitutes the overt, highly conscious and articulate effort of women to deal with the attack which men are now making upon culture, an attack which women properly understand as an attack upon themselves as women and upon their own legitimate demands for a new life which will not be the new non-life being offered to them by Malamud and his colleagues. The work, for instance, of Doris Lessing has this as it substance; and to call Miss Lessing's novel, The Golden Notebooks, or her stories an enterprise of conservation is distinctly not to pass pejorative judgment on them; it is simply to describe them in their essential motive.

Margaret Mead, in Male and Female, remarks upon the salient fact that in all known societies, the work that occupies men is the superior work. If men hunt and fight, then hunting and fighting are the superior occupations of that society; if men weave and care for the babies, then weaving and bady-care have the superior prestige. The principle inherent in this observation operates unmistakably in our literary society: the way men write is apparently the superior, the more prestigeful, way to write, and the woman who would win a high literary status is constrained to conspire in man's view of the world: and this is especially the case at the top levels of literary seriousness. Thus, in The Benefactor, the recent first novel of a young woman writer of notable gift, Susan Sontag, there is nothing in either its matter or manner to suggest the sex of its authorship. Not only is the central character a man but a man who is the very personification of depersonalization, if we can put is so. In the story Miss Sontag tells, a man lives his dreams; it is all the life he can have - certainly there couldn't be a more contemporary conception.

But this is a very conscious exercise Miss Sontag is engaged in, and therefore unusual. For the most part, the present-day serious female writer echoes the male voice in ways far more unconscioss than this and even - which is the significant point - in the very midst of following her own more conservative, or conserving, line. A striking, and surprising, instance is Mary McCarthy. Although as a critic Miss McCarthy stands in the forefront of the modern movement in literary thought - she has been the most ardent celebrant, for instance, of Burroughs' nihilistic The Naked Lunch - as the author of The Group she has frankly undertaken to revive the novel of social specificity. It is of course of more than casual interest that The Group could not, however, be placed in the contemporary world; it is an historical novel, set in the 1930s, when society was not only admitted to literary awareness but represented its sole reality. Yet modernity intrudes itself even into Miss McCarthy's reconstruction of a period whose sensibility was so different from ours today - certainly the disconnection between the men and women in The Group is a strong premonition of the isolation we know now in the 50s and 60s. It is as if Miss McCarthy cannot take back into the past emotions which are not now permitted to a writer in tune with her times. As a matter of fact, even the intense loyalties that are supposed to bind Miss McCarthy's Vassar classmates have a ring of falsification: the close relationships of these seven girls is forced, over-created, factitious. And the idea occurs to at least one reader that Miss McCarthy's seven heroines are not really seven differentiated individuals but seven aspects of herself - seven facets, that is, of an author unwillingly and unwittingly snared in the contemporary commitment to self.

A case could be made, I think, for the thesis that the commitment to the self was, in fact, contributed to contemporary fiction by the woman writer and that it is part of the demasculinization of modern man - a part he fails to recognize - that in his role of author he has borrowed a peculiarly female method for making his stand against the savage impersonality of modern life. Perhaps women were quicker than men to perceive the cruel direction of the modern world - though not so quick to accede in its victory over the individual. In our own century, certainly, from the time of Dorothy Richardson right down to our present-day women writers for The New Yorker, the female self has been the locus of all the sensibility presumed to have been left us in modern society. Katharine Mansfield, who put herself to school to Chekhov, could learn from him only a superficial style of objective narration; her stories were actually dedicated to the glorification of her own precise and delicate spirit. And it was Virginia Woolf who formalized the stream-of-consciousness technique as the most suitable method for re-enacting the miracle of being oneself in an environment bent on one's destruction.

This self-mythologizing impulse has far from played itself out in the work of women - Katherine Anne Porter's Ship of Fools, also an historical novel, is a useful statement about life as it is or was only insofar as are willing to generalize from one woman's exercise in self-definition. And manifestly this is not very far, although it is hard to see why, except for reasons of man's dominance in culture, there should be any more validity in generalizing about the Negro population from James Baldwin than about the rest of the white population from Miss Porter.

What I am trying to say here, in short, is that if men have seemed to take the lead in making our contemporary spiritual formulations, they have had, and continue to have, considerable cooperation from the opposite sex which, in so many of its expressions, would seem to exercise a restraining or even a retrograde force in the cultural movement of the times. Or perhaps the nub of the situation is that art tells the truth, whatever the sex of the artist or the conflicts peculiar to his sex, and that the real world is deserting us, society is destroying us, leaving us nothing but the immediate and existential self with which to try to counter the dark external power.

At any rate, a culture in which men tell women they are neither loving nor loveable is no more likely to produce love stories written by women than a culture in which women tell men that they are incapable of appreciating the special female poeticalness is likely to produce, from men, a fiction of solid and shared feeling. The gap between classes closes in the modern world; the gap in the emotional connection between men and women widens - desperately widens, if we are to judge by literature and by the peripheral literary arts. We return, for instance, to our fashion models in our magazines for young women with a new perception of what it is that makes for those bizarre postures and those expressions of outraged bewilderment. It is a current cliche that women's clothes are designed for them by homosexuals who don't like them and don't want them to look their best. Not so well recognized is the fact that these clothes are being exhibited by a race of female creatures who no longer know what it means to be at their best, who no longer know where they stand or how to stand, what to think or whether they should think at all or how to comport themselves in a world so alien to their biological disposition. Such being the extreme dilemma of the contemporary young woman, small wonder that the best she can do is to try to deny her isolation and confirm her womanliness in the quickest possible, public assertion of her connectedness - marriage - and in rapid and repeated child-bearing. The suburbanization of our well-educated young women, their retreat from professional careers, is not, I'm afraid, quite so simple as a mere retreat from unfavorable working conditions.

Sometimes, to confront boldly the positive image of contemporary young womanhood in our literary culture is indeed to confront such an extravagant evidence of emotional waywardness and disconnection that it is difficult to align the image with our everyday experience of decent, hard-working girls going to college, studying, dancing, engaging in athletics, graduating from college, worrying about jobs, worrying about beaux, worrying about meeting the bills, worrying about the baby's sinuses and schooling, managing, progressing. For the image that has been suggested by art is virtually that of a mutation in the species. I daresay there has not been a mutation of the species, actually. Yet I can in all gravity raise the question whether we have not already been faced, in the contemporary practice of psychiatry, with a premonition of such a mutation, psychological to begin with, but with possible physiological consequences. I intrude here into the province of the psychiatric professions; it may be that they have the evidence to dispute the intuition of a student of literature, that what we observe in the literary culture already has its clinical counterpart: in the disappearance, say, of the old hysterical neurosis and its replacement by what I believe is called the characterological neurosis, where the complaint which brings the patient into treatment is so frequently just the inability to feel, and where the illness exists on some dim borderline between the neurosis and psychosis of older psychiatric textbooks. Certainly the very clinical currency of words like "isolation" and "affectlessness" must point to the new prevalence of the symptoms these words describe, just as the practice of the new ego psychology - the study of the mechanisms by which the ego defends itself - suggests a relation to the increasing emphasis on the self in literature. I am not of course saying that our literature is making us sick - although I would not rule out the proposition that modern art abets, quite as much as it mirrors, the life we live. I merely stress the belief that cultural revolutions are revolutions in more than that single manifestation of culture, art, and that the reiteration of a given pattern of human activity or sensibility to the point where it describes a whole literary era is not perhaps to be written off the evolutionary record as a mere accident, a sport.

With all of which I come back to the subject of this conference - the situation of the woman of superior talent in our colleges. I am afraid that if my portrait of the modern human condition, including the modern female condition, as I find it in contemporary writing, is accurate, it isn't much of a student we are teaching in our schools but some poor lost creature, unloved, unloving, unconnected with either her fellows or the ongoing enterprise of society, rather paranoiac about the social authority, herself perhaps a borderline psychotic, her best and most creative energies devoted to a self-definition that has no goal except the knowledge of how little of her possibility life permits her to realize. Well, this is the trouble with letting oneself be captive to one's own diagnostic plausibility - for we all of us know that, for every generalization I have made tonight, there exists a counter-generalization just as well-based in our practical everyday experience of contemporary young womanhood if not in our experience of literature. Nor is it to withdraw the speculation I just put forward - that our very race and biology may be changing - to allude to a striking exemplification I had, just a few weeks ago, of the complexity and antitheses in which we pursue our lives as people concerned with the fate of the young. I had been asked to be a judge in a literary competition in a woman's college. Not many manuscripts had been sent to me, they had been weeded through by preliminary readers, but in those I did receive there was more evidence than anyone needs of a culture dramatically at odds with itself. There was indeed proof extraordinary of the tendencies I have dwelt on this evening - stories which might have been written to specification by the movement of modernity. But there were stories, as well, which so contradicted the literary tendencies of our time that they stood like a caution against the general conclusions I have indulged in tonight.

The story that particularly impressed me, perhaps because I had already begun to think about this speech, was about a young man, bored and lonely on a New York summer evening, who, in trying to reach a friend on the phone, reaches, instead, an unknown girl named Myrtle, with whom he arranges for a meeting at a bar. Except that her name, he discovers, is not Myrtle. In fact, she has no fixed name; she is anything anyone chooses to call her. And this vagueness of identity is joined to a vagueness in her apprehension of reality so acute that communication between the young man and herself, once they meet at the bar, is restricted to such charged remarks as "What about another beer?" or "Shall we go now?" - to both of which the answer is yes. The young man takes her to his apartment where she readily, and still without verbal communication, undresses and lies naked on the bed. But when the young man thinks to make love to his beautiful visitor, he looks into her eyes to lose himself in their fathomlessness; even the next morning he cannot approach her except by closing his own eyes and forcing himself upon all this vacuity. The girl leaves; and the young man finds himself hopelessly addicted to this mirage that has entered his life. But he can't find her, she is utterly without habitation or connection. Then, as suddenly and inexplicably as she had first appeared to him, the girl reappears - and again the young man takes his fierce isolate pleasure from her. Finally, she goes away for good and with her departure from the young man's life, we gather that a big nameless chunk of significance has departed as well. Emptiness has entered emptiness and begotten emptiness.

I recounted this story to a literary young man I chanced to speak with a few days later. His response was "Say, that sounds good," and I don't know why I was surprised. He asked me if I had given Myrtle my vote for the prize. When I answered no, he commented on a note of disapproval he said he heard in my voice. Why did I disapprove of such a story, he wanted to know. And by way of explanation I told him of the stories for which I did cast my votes. They were a story about a family taking an aged grandmother to a nursing home; a story about a young architect who becomes involved with some neighbors whose personal history fascinates and baffles him; a story about two young girls who, in a country town, are made custodians - spiritual custodians - of the graveyard of their forbears; a true and touching story about two young boys, high school fiends, reunited after a year in which one of them has gone away to college. Were the stories I had favored better stories, more talented than the story of Myrtle, my literary friend inquired? I could not answer, except to say that I was not prepared to specify what I mean by literary talent in writers so young as these. I had voted, not so much for talent, as against chic, against the easy availability of current style and attitude. For if there is to be a moral revolution in my lifetime, I prefer that it involve a certain moral strenuousness to guaranty it to me - I do not conceive it to be my role to push what is already going down such a well-greased slide.

I am not sure that my answer was useful to the young man. It would be my guess that he felt that I had betrayed my responsibility as a judge of literature in having made my choice for the prize on the basis of what he would call social or moral, rather than literary, values. Certainly it would be difficult to persuade anyone committed to what we call modernity that its existence - that the existence of the modern spirit in art - depends upon a continuing dialogue in our general life of culture; that without the structure of society, there can be no social revolution or that, without traditional morality, there can be no breakthrough into a new moral enlightenment. Yet of course, difficult as it is to explain to the young, this is something that is being dramatically demonstrated under our very eyes today, for instance in the racial situation - nothing could be more striking than the fact that it is only since the Supreme Court decision on desegregation that the Negro has come to demand his equal rights. It took an act of traditional morality, referring back to the Bill of Rights, to awaken the revolutionary spirit of the Negro population.

Analagously, the efforts of a Conference such as this in which you are now sharing are not without their part in the dialectical process of which our contemporary artistic culture is one of the terms, and this is even the more so because the dominant image of youth in present-day literature is probably so very remote from the image you have in mind as you devise your programs for the education of young people of superior intellectual endowment. The existence of the contradictions in American life to which I have tried to draw your attention this evening are nothing to be afraid of, so long as we recognize that they do exist and may even, in some odd unfathomable way, lend strength to each other.

WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

by

David Riesman

I want to get a discussion going even though many of us will feel that what we have to say on these matters after two and a half days is somewhat redundant. As I had written my notes before coming here, I watched one after another of the things which I had wanted to say either said in the various discussions or blurted out by me personally. I will have to apologize to those of you who have heard remarks of this sort before in the various sessions, but I don't think that's too serious a problem since we all can afford to go over these matters again and again.

I have several themes of which my first is the peculiar minority nature of women. Before they come to school they have been brought up by mothers, and they meet women in elementary school as teachers: their problems towards these mentors of the same sex are different from those of boys who, as many have pointed out, are more rebellious because they are trying to differentiate themselves from the opposite sex. The girls are less rebellious because this is not an issue for them and they are also less rebellious because less rebellion is allowed to them. One reason this is so is that women are on to the tricks of other women; I've heard it said several times in these meetings and *I believe it to be true that the worst enemies of* the talented woman are other women. And this begins very early indeed. It begins when one is a daughter; it begins when one is a pupil of other women.

This lack of rebellion is not a negative quality per se. What it does involve is that girls in school do not cultivate what Michael Maccoby in his Harvard doctoral thesis called the "game attitude." When Mr. Walmsley of the University of Pennsylvania was talking in one of our groups this afternoon about the particular characteristics of women in the natural sciences, it was one of the implications that they haven't learned the kind of combativeness as little girls which is valuable in theoretical physics and indeed in many of the disciplines (about which I will have more to say later). One of the ways in which the lesser rebellion of women is shown is that in the prestige colleges today they drop out less; they may quit, but they don't drop out to return in the ways that boys do - 20 to 25% of the boys now drop out of Harvard for nonacademic reasons such as to see life, and how good or bad it is, and then come back to graduate. Nothing at all comparable is the case with girls. Their orbits are narrower at whatever stage, as Mirra Komarovsky pointed out long ago. They don't go away as far; they don't hitch-hike; and as I say, they don't play games. They don't play baseball in the same way. At the same time, they are more adept in the social atmosphere of the school and in the people-oriented aspects of school. They are more responsive, they are more responsible; and it's curious the way in which all these virtues come, in the university setting, almost to be defects.

Let me say at the outset what my model or Utopia is. It's not different from those I've heard in the last two days: I see men and women as different in the sense that there are two overlapping curves in which bio-cultural differences influence the distribution of the two groups the world over, but should not affect the fate of individuals. That is, there are individual women who on everything you could name are more like most men than most men are, and vice-versa. Emphasis on these differences is characteristic of both racist and psychological discussion of women (which is a problem for psychologists and for anthropologists); the emphasis on these differences, as in the case of Jim Crow, can be confining; and it can be an excuse, and often is an excuse, for invidious treatment of the "minority" of women, since women outlive men, much to their regret. On the other hand, emphasis on the differences can, as I've often found in discussion with girls, be liberating in the sense that the "minority's" self-defined "failure" seems less total if it is less badly understood. Let me be clear. Not all girls must be receptive and responsible and not all men must be performance- or game-oriented, but as Erikson's play configurations suggest, our culture pushes early in this direction, and nothing in the bio-psychological equipment of women prevents this happening. Some of the things Mr. Weir said yesterday bear exactly on this. Now the peculiar nature of women as a minority is that they have very little solidarity. On the contrary, all of us have heard a great many women say that they like men in a way that implies that they don't like women. They use words like "hen parties" about themselves, or other deprecatory concepts; that's a way of saying they don't like "mannish" women. Men never say that they don't like men, indeed there are many stag cultures, whether in academic life, law, medicine, engineering or hunting. Carl Degler notes in his essay in the Daedalus issue, which many of you know, that all or almost all women are tied to a man or more than one and can't unite in political and polemical attack - there is no Black Muslim organization for women as a result.

Of course this doesn't mean women are powerless; no minority is powerless, even in the worst case. And even in lands of Islamic or machismo outlook dominated by what may be called male vanity cultures (of which we have a mild version in America), women are able to force men to fight each other for them, fight over honor, and otherwise manipulate their idiocies. Even Sisters in a convent or a college are Brides of Christ and subject to bishops, as anyone can find out who reads Sister Formation Conference reports and, as John Cogley recently noted in The Commonweal, Sisters are also subject to man-made canon law. And in general women at every turn look to male models and tend to be suspicious of each other as any peasant or other suppressed group is likely to be. One reason for this is that they know what the other woman is getting away with.

Now I think that one of the reasons - at least I'd like to put this forth as a suggestion and hear comment about it if you think I'm mistaken, as I very well may be - one of the reasons why there are fewer women going on today, not in absolute but in relative terms, in the professions, including academia, is that academia itself is moving more in a "male" direction in the sense of performance-orientation of a meritocratic sort. I'm speaking here only of the leading institution in which there is a declining concern for knowledge "for its own sake," the famous phrase of the liberal arts, and in which as a result the insistence on "doing something" with the knowledge makes it harder for women who can be less clear about this, for reasons we've been discussing these last days.

It's true that, at the same time, role definitions of men are loosening and it seems to me that, the country over, non-coeducational institutions for women are losing their appeal. The great appeal in places like Tufts' Jackson, Harvard's Radcliffe, Brown's Pembroke, Penn's Woman's College, and so on, is that they offer non-coeducation plus men. And then I look at the bulletin of, let us say Clarke College, in Dubuque, it says it's near Loras and Wellesley is near everything, much in the way in which colleges try to be at once metropolitan and beautiful and suburban. So, too, among men there is somewhat of a trend away from the stag college. At least there's a certain restlessness that I've observed in places like Dartmouth and

Bowdoin and Wesleyan.

While these tendencies towards loosening of the boundaries are evident, there is also an increasing purposiveness of a kind of "post Sputnik" sort in higher education which pushes the whole institution in a "masculine direction." The collegiate is being driven out for better and for worse, and the idle curiosity of the "higher collegiate," the Bohemian, is under a good deal of pressure, in spite of obvious and often pleasant survivals. And this means that boys have learned to work before they get to college and college itself becomes a preparatory institution, in a way that the data presented to us by Ray Cuzzort indicates. A very interesting undergraduate thesis was done several years ago at Harvard called "Andover to Harvard." It was a study of a particular cadre of Andover seniors who had come to Harvard as compared with a comparable group who had gone from Andover to Yale, and Andover has in the past been Yale oriented. The Harvards at Andover were the ones who ran the student paper, read the kind of books Diana Trilling was talking about, and couldn't wait to get out of the Yalee atmosphere at Andover to what they thought of as the intellectual and exciting and cosmopolitan atmosphere at Harvard. They did not differ so much in College Board scores from the Yalees, but in styles of life. When they entered Harvard they went through shock, as they discovered that the neighborhood had been tipped in favor of the grinds, as they thought, and the only alternatives available to them were to be a playboy or to be a grind - neither of which they liked. They suddenly realized that they had more in common with the Yale-bound Andover seniors than they ever imagined they would have. They found Harvard abrasive and competitive.

Many of the dropouts at Harvard are reactions to this. Early intimacy with girls is another reaction - a personal refuge with a girl in an impersonal world. In spite of all this, the boys work because there is a goal ahead, in other words, to get into medical school or graduate school. And the girls work in comparable settings for different reasons, for different motives which we've been cogitating here. They work because of the routine, perhaps they work because of the interpersonal reward from their teachers which I think is more important to them. And they work because they are a minority who have to prove themselves.

What they don't always realize is that they are working against the grain in a "male" world in terms of the fields, as well as in terms of the game- or performance-orientation. That is, they realize that the boy's task of identification with his college work is easier because it's increasingly pre-vocational. Even if what the student from Andover is learning to become is a professor of English, he can still study in an English department which is very early oriented to the profession of becoming a professor of English. The girl doesn't so easily see herself in the higher Jim Crow of our universities as becoming a professor of English because she hasn't met one who is an attractive woman. And the disciplines themselves are taught in such a way as to suggest that the particular gifts that girls bring, the gifts that result in the kinds of early experience which I mentioned, are not especially valued. A girl who comes into psychology, as many do in many women's colleges and men's colleges too, and who says to her teacher that she is interested in people gets a kick in the teeth. Psychology has nothing to do with people, she is told; the subject is taught in such a way as to make that clear. The girl who comes into sociology, at many institutions, well I can put the matter more dramatically, by saying that I was talking recently with a professor of sociology at Berkeley who was telling me with enormous pride that at long last by severe rigor and emphasis on methods they had tipped the balance in their undergraduate curriculum and there were now more boys than girls studying sociology. The possibility that girls who are going on to be community leaders, legislators, and so on, as Professor Eells suggested yesterday, might profit from a course in sociology, might understand their own situation as a minority even perhaps better as a result of a course in sociology, did not occur to this professor who was only thinking of disciples.

What is the reaction of girls to models which are masculine in these subtle and infiltrated ways? One of them is a kind of uneasy and unspecified discomfort. Mr. Heist's data presented yesterday suggests the forms this dissatisfaction takes among the specially talented women who are intellectual but not academic. Mr. Cuzzort's data also makes the same implication. And I think what is experienced by many girls in the best institutions is a feeling of personal inadequacy. They feel that they lack ability in the fields in which they are working. This is general for both sexes, but we are talking about girls and perhaps they feel it more. I have experiences again and again at Radcliffe of the following sort. I think of a girl, extremely intelligent and articulate, competent, poised, attractive. She only got a magna cum laude degree and she almost decided to drop out of scholarship. I had a hard time time to persuade her that she was still among the tiny fraction of the most gifted people on the whole planet. And until she got at last to graduate school after a year on a Fulbright Fellowship abroad, she didn't really believe me. She thought that a girl had to get a summa in order to have any chance of going on. And when I heard Professor Lowell Kelly yesterday talk about the fate of even the brightest girl in psychology at Michigan, I felt misgivings about having actually sent this girl on to graduate study or encouraged her to go on. Not for the first time.

Another reaction of the girls to the male model is what one might call the new-nation-overtaken-and-surpassed reaction of rigid conformism. I have quoted many times Diana Trilling's great remark, "Girls at Radcliffe have to feel that they are getting as bad an education as the boys are getting in order to feel that they are getting a good one."

But another reaction, which I notice especially in the sciences and in the social sciences, is the rejection not of the "male" definition, a "male" provinciality within science, using these terms male and female very much in quotation marks, but a rejection of science itself as inhumane, rigid, mechanical and so on. The difficulty with such ideas is that they tend to be self-confirming, especially when they are supported by vocational counseling; and they are supported even more by the fact that what students see of different levels of a field is the bottom of the iceberg which is often extremely different from the top (something I'll have more to say about in a moment). Still another reaction of women to what they discover as to the nature of academic disciplines is, as I said in Esther Raushenbush's group this afternoon, learning to play the game as a game. I was talking recently to a tutor in history at Harvard who said that the freshman girl comes in and doesn't know that the way to get ahead in the history department is to attack the professors and all the books. By the time she is a senior she knows very well, if she wants to get ahead this is the way to do it. He said this in discussion with a group of girls, and the girls' reaction to the suggestion that they play the role of being a boy and be combative was that this was lacking in integrity and it would destroy them as persons and as women to do it. My own attitude on this is more perplexed. That is, it seems to me that it would be possible to teach girls to play the game without committing themselves fully to it, in order to get through, and in order to do well, in order to get a feeling of accomplishment even from something that they had doubts about. But the girls themselves, given the attitudes toward integrity and the personality and so on which these particularly literate and literary women are receptive to (of the sort Diana Trilling talked about last night), didn't think that they could compromise with the system.

Another way in which girls react, and these all overlap as you can imagine, is for girls who reject science to decide that the only place to be human is in the arts. One might call this the run around end. However, in the private university of the Ivy League sort, this is an almost impossible route, because this is a male-dominated verbal environment and girls can succeed not in art but in history of art, not in music but in musicology, and so on, as all of you know. In the state universities, the girls are better off in this respect although at the same time they may be confined by the understanding that arts are only for women; and of course this makes perfectly clear what is implicit all along in what I've said, namely, that every boundary we impose on women we impose upon men also. And many men react to the world just in the way that girls do, rejecting science as inhumane for example, and rejecting "male" definitions for their abstractness and conceptualization, as lacking in existential qualities and as imposing categories on reality. In fact I'm sure that in all the different groups that met today, there were many people of both sexes who felt that any generalization that a person like myself tried to make was an imposition.

I'm not suggesting, in what I've said so far, that people are becoming narrower. I'm talking about the pressures on them, for protograduate work in undergraduate colleges. But there are also many defenses that young people find against these pressures, defenses of varying intrinsic quality. The Peace Corps is one such defense on graduation where even the amateur can make a contribution, or school teaching which even talented women go into, although they might be equipped to do other things, because as teachers they can make a contribution.

Girls understandably fear the career specialization that boys crave in college, because they think of it as narrowing the marriage market, as there are certain careers that can only be pursued with a certain kind of a spouse either in terms of his orbits, where he will be located, or in terms of what he will permit. And there is of course the fear which some of us have talked about today, that all the good, especially the older men, will be taken if one waits while one is defining one's own quality as a girl. In this same discussion at Radcliffe several weeks ago, a number of girls were saying: We wish we could put off marriage until we knew who we were and therefore could present ourselves as a more finished product to a husband who would have a harder time molding us to his desires if we are fully formed. He might then not want us. And this will be a selective process. At the same time in the university environment we are meeting older men who want to get married now and are putting pressure on us to get married now, pressure of course in which the whole population concurs.

There are certain careers which girls can only pursue in a few places. I was talking recently to a girl who was doing graduate work and teaching psychology at MIT, whose husband is in advertising. The husband would prefer to be in New York where there are more opportunities for him, and the woman feels very guilty, though he has some opportunities in Massachusetts because of the particular field in which he's working. She couldn't pursue the same interests in New York. Even the slight impediment on her husband's career, which is temporary, makes her feel very bad, and she said to me she really wishes she had insisted on their going to New York and that it isn't right for a girl, even in this slight way, to hold her man up. I thought to myself that a wife can be "ill" as many Victorians managed to be, and she could even be extravagant, as many American women manage to be, but she cannot subordinate her husband explicitly and knowingly to her own career. And of course we talked in these last days about the terrible fear that haunts intellectual women that they may be obviously brighter than their spouses. Here again we see the game attitude of competitiveness of work in which one measures such things and in which one sees other people around the couple measuring such things. It is worse to be brighter than one's husband than to beat him in tennis. A girl should be better looking, that's not an axis on which men and women compete, and if a Negro - she should be lighter, and it's perfectly all right for her to be of higher class if her husband is successful. And incidentally, this is one indication of many that it is wrong to insist that our culture is anti-intellectual, granted there are anti-intellectual elements, because if intellectuality were less important, the fact that one or another spouse is brighter or stupider would be less important. But the verdict of "stupid" is more terrifying to both sexes than, let us say, the verdict of "clumsy" - one reason why I can't believe that athletics is really overemphasized: it's kind of a side show in which people pretend that it is more important.

What can be done? I want to suggest very briefly both some long run and some short run considerations; first, some long run ones:

One has to think about changing the balance in the whole educational system, especially putting women into the sciences and men into the arts and humanities, putting women into the universities and men into the elementary schools. And I'd like to experiment with boarding schools for both sexes, coed boarding schools, to create a kind of greater ease and solidarity across the sex line, such as I find in such boarding schools as Putney or Woodstock: there are very few of these. I'd also like to see diminish the manpower approach to higher education: the Cold War game of having people serve various careers because of their good for the country. Mr. Kelly had something to say about that. This cuts girls out of chances for fellowships in graduate study, or even for admission, on the ground that they will marry and the knowledge poured out by their professors will leak away. It always seemed to me that we should be in this respect much more generous and wasteful, and that we shouldn't consider it wasteful: we should consider graduate school, like undergraduate school, a form of general education; and consider that everyone can profit the more they have of it. Whatever they do with it later certainly may have an impact on their lives. Yet I know how difficult it is to pursuade fellowship committees of this. This is not only for such mixed motives as the feeling by the professor that a girl will never be his disciple, if she gets married, and will not extend his name and fame (and patronage network to still another underprivileged institution). But there is also the feeling that there are many valuable young men who are trying for admission, and that it would be unfair to keep them out and take a chance on a woman who may drop out. This puts a tremendous burden on these women, rather like the problem of the Russian exchange student who was recently at Harvard and who knew and was told and well understood that if he defected, as he for a time did, it would make the exchange program for people like himself enormously difficult in the future. Even so, I feel that we must allow the individual to decide her own course and feel, well, that's perfectly all right, that's one of the chances this society owes them.

In addition, there must be in the long run a much greater live-and-let-live spirit among women themselves towards the roads not taken. The woman who is resentful because she feels defined by the career woman as "just a housewife" must relax and stop punishing the career woman, and the latter must not be ashamed because of her alleged mismanagement of her family, alleged usually more than real, because she is being defensive vis-a-vis the intrepidly "giving" mothers who do so much giving that they are a danger to their children.

These are long run changes and we talked about them in these last days, but the girls who are in college now or in the next immediate years are not going to be helped very much by them. Just as one wouldn't close down the Negro colleges of the South now, because we are going in for an integrated education, so we have to have short run suggestions for the girls who are in college now. I want to make several.

The principal one is that there be more effort to help women case the joint of the man's world when they come to college, so they know what they are up against. The novels Diana Trilling was talking about, the literary descriptions, treat women with contempt and she could have named many more, and girls lap up this invidious literature or they lap up the literature like Lord of the Flies which leaves them out entirely. There is today no female ethnocentrism about "a room of one's own." They have an enormous interest in the descriptions of the worlds of boys and boys views of them, and they have very little literature in which they can see themselves with reasonable objectivity. A thesis done at Radcliffe, called "World Enough and Time," suggested that the girls regarded study as work and dates as work, but other girls took second place in a very busy schedule. The girls have each other only secondarily as allies; they have each other as rivals, and they don't help each other case the joint in the man's world, other than perhaps in the sexual realm.

And yet do girls want to be told the subtle limits they face as a sex? Often I feel they do not, often I feel they do not want to be told even the facts of the present distribution of talents and interests among the sexes even if these facts are interpreted in terms of social (rather than biological) definition. I think everything depends on how this is done. If it is presented to girls as one more barrier, and this time a very insidious one because it has an apparent sympathy, and psychological and anthropological citations, this can be very destructive, in saying to girls you can't do this because it will make you that, and you won't make it anyway. I don't think one can predict the picture that well. One may want to put pressure on the future through girls who are capable of doing more than at any moment in history than they are allowed to do. But at the same time one doesn't want to create martyrs and casualties to one's Utopian hopes for the future. I think that what one wants to point out to girls is how the joint looks, how far they now can go, how far they might be able to go, so that when they don't make it, they won't feel that it was all their fault, at the same time that they don't get an alibi, like that so many Negroes now in college have, because they can blame it all on the white world or on imperialism.

One can point out without providing an alibi to girls in college (please remember I'm talking about the better institutions and the more talented and ambitious girls) certain what one might call secondary gains of their minority status. They don't have to make money immediately, for instance, or as much money. They do not have to do many distasteful things that men feel they must do to get ahead. They have more need and more possibility to discover their own interests.

In this casing of the joint I want to place a great premium on the sociology of science, and on precisely the kind of brilliant analysis some of us were fortunate enough to hear today from Mr. Walmsley. Science as presented in high school and often in college is the tremendous middle level, underwater part of the iceberg. It says absolutely nothing, or almost nothing, or maybe the opposite, about science as practiced in its top region, which is free-wheeling, intuitive, imaginative, poetic, and which almost nobody ever sees, except the people who are up there. One thing which girls may see and find unpleasant is a kind of sadism toward the material of nature that many scientists and many technologists have. Man has ordered the universe around, rather than listening to it with a third ear. But this may reflect not science but a particular stage of certain sciences, and disciplinary polemic and development. In sociology for example, and in anthropology, and in different ways psychology, there is a tremendous need for field workers who can get access to aspects of society beyond the usual ken. An anthropologist a few years ago published pseudonomously a novel called Return to Laughter, which is the most magnetic account I know of the human problems of being a field worker in an African tribe, and when I recently wrote an introduction to a paperback edition of the book, I criticized the woman who wrote it, whom I didn't know, for writing it under a pseudonym because I felt that she had done this because it didn't seem to be science, although actually what she had done helped science more than most ethnographic monographs which pretend that the anthropologist who publishes the material wasn't there, as a body or as a person, as a person of a particular sex, and of a particular disposition. What is necessary is to explain to students the gateways in different fields and how different the gateway looks from the way the field looks once one gets inside. And then explain that, if you make it inside, you might find more room. In fact you may change the field, because the field is suffering from the provinciality of the gateway. Indeed, men in fields called female-social work, some kinds of psychiatry - may be especially insecure and may need to masculinize the field, and girls ought to be aware of this. And they ought to be aware of the need of women in the old overtake-and-surpass tradition in those fields who are playing that game.

All this is a large order because the kind of investigation of the subtleties of the breeds of men and women drawn into the different fields and the way their temperaments, their sex, their training, and the particular history of the field react, has hardly begun. There is some data: Ann Roe and other scholars describe the outlook of people in different fields, but there is really very little of the profile of the intellectual nature of the very rapidly changing fields of intellectual life. One needs also to look at social class as well as sex. One needs to see that an Amy Lowell or a Gertrude Stein has a kind of upper-class or haute bourgeoise resiliency which is denied most of our more democratically inclined women. We need to see that the remark "Who do you think you are?" is a greater assault on a woman's boldness than it usually is on a man's. And we need to present young women now in college with models of femininity who are assertive, much as American Negroes may learn from Trinidad Negroes how to be dignified though colored. We need the defense of women against the parochialism of the literary past, as Mrs. Trilling described so hauntingly last night. One of the ways of doing this is to show the oppressed minority of women what's in it for the oppressor. Although girls being what they are, this will arouse sympathy for the oppressor rather than rebelliousness, it may modify the fear that many girls have when they are being intellectual and when they are being firm and assertive, that they are being in the literary jargon castrating or incapable of giving.

Now I'd like to start discussion.

DISCUSSION

George R. Waggoner: In terms of practical measures inside universities with reference to casing the joint, it would occur to me that institutional devices such as the freshman seminars that I watched run a year or so ago, small and informal and intimate and going beyond, lacking the rigorous structure of most undergraduate courses, are probably a very useful device for casing the joint, in a sense, early. Particularly one which is coeducational and informal.

David Riesman: Yes, in fact, as you know I use a freshman seminar in just that way. I required everyone who came into it to take a particularly demanding "new criticism" course in the humanities which most of the boys would not have taken and not many of the girls either because it is really thought of as the most difficult of the humanities general education courses. And I had to make a treaty with the man who gave it to get a class of students into it whom he would not ordinarily have accepted. This is not the honors pattern but it has some of the honors qualities because this is a kind of honors course. And I said to the people, "You have to take it to get into the seminar, you have no choice, it's counter-cyclical with what I'm doing. I can be loose because it's rigorous and I'll live with you through it." I also tried to get them into a particular natural science course which was not the gut natural science course which the girl takes who is going to work for *Mademoiselle* magazine. I did my best to present the students with the kind of free-wheeling scientists whom I mentioned, such as George Wald, the biology, and others, so to give them a sense that the kinds of noises they had been hearing from the biologists in high school were not the kinds of noises they might hear if they persevered in the field. As Dean Waggoner suggests, I think this did work to give the students, and especially the girls, a sense of solidarity, a sense of a home base, and a place to which they could come and talk which was different from an outside counseling service. One trouble with most outside counseling, in the places in which I've seen it, is that it itself isn't familiar with the subtleties of the sociology of intellectual life, within the institution, and therefore it might sympathize with a girl and say "Oh yes, we understand that math is tough," but it couldn't say that that math teacher is crazy and a "C" with him means that you have a career made for you in math.

Robert E. Johnson: I have a very long introduction to my question, it does have a point ultimately. I was walking down 57th Street today and I noticed the various dogs being taken out. This is unusual because I come from a very small town in Illinois where we let dogs run loose. And it reminded me of a science fiction story by Ray Bradbury which I read some time ago, and the point was that the dogs were running the civilization and they talk to each other and said what shall I make my master do? Shall he take me for a ride, to get an ice cream cone, etc.? And I don't want to tell this with the ladies here but it does seem to me that for the last two days in those sessions which I attended, there has been a feeling of sympathy for those poor girls and I'm not at all sure that I approve of this because a woman has the option of either making a living or somebody else making a living and all the girls do. The girls have a choice that we don't have. They can be intellectuals, they can be married intellectuals, they can be spinster intellectuals, they can be spinster non-intellectuals. And my question then is, it seems to me that in my honors program at Illinois I was facing all the time the problem of what kind of discussion can I carry on with my colleague who is a very fine elderly spinster and making her living as an intellectual with men; or my wife who is an intellectual and not making her living because I give her a very good living if I may say (we have a little problem, if we would buy fewer books we would have an even better living), or the average honor student girl I have who is sort of temporary? She can make her living, she doesn't have to make her living, her husband can make her living or vice-versa, or the young lady here who is seeing her husband through school. It seems to me I'm not at all sympathetic with the discussion of the last two or three days. How do you sort out these various categories in the girl early and what's the advice you can give them that will help them? They have three careers and men have one.

David Riesman: I suggested in my remarks, you may remember, there were secondary gains and you have mentioned some. I think that there are many problems with the - even the truth - and there is a truth in what you say which is a little like the truth of the rich man who says to the poor man, "Do you want all my ulcers? You'll have a much easier time." I think the trouble is that the men have created a payroll which everyone in this society, both sexes, has some compulsion to meet, even if, as you say, the girls are encouraged, permitted, indulged even, when they don't need it. I think that if one had a truly egalitarian society more could be asked of the women, more would be asked of them, and I think they would be better off. I think there are, of course, women who exploit this situation, and I suggested, you may remember, another thing, which is that no minority is powerless and that they manipulate their oppressors and your Ray Bradbury story is a nice one. Let me mention incidentally, an illustration from the session I was in this afternoon of the kinds of problems of generalization which one can get into here. I commented on the basis of some empirical observations that girls didn't read science fiction. And I was immediately contradicted by an overwhelming vote of the girls in that room that they read it, that they knew other girls who read it, that they had a whole collection of Galaxy magazines and so on. And yet, of course, it's true as a generalization that girls don't read science fiction. They don't see themselves on the whole in a pleasant light as the Veblenian kept ladies. They don't like that sense of themselves, any more than they like the "momism" sense of themselves as running the country, which I think is false. To say that they do is John Birchism applied to women; it has a right-wing flavor. I think the values, the qualities that are valued in America , are the male qualities. And I think that the problem that really confronts us is: can one short-cut this, can one say to girls, as my effort was to say to them: look at the male world, make it in it if you want, and then these are the things you have to do. Don't alibi your self out of it, and indulge yourself in the cocoon life; that will not be satisfying for a life, even though it may for a short time. When you were talking about 57th Street, I thought you were going to say something very different, namely, how many fur-coated, middle-aged, absolutely miserable-faced, under-employed, well-to-do women you had seen on 57th, as this is what strikes me.

How can women short-cut men's world without having made it in that world by men's terms? This is really the question I'd rather deal with than the way you put it.

Joseph W. Cohen: I would like to ask quite a specific question. You talked of long run things you want to change and you talked also of more immediate things perhaps more easily changed. Your illustrations, assertions, came on the whole from Harvard, Radcliffe, Bowdoin, Wesleyan, etc., but somehow or other I missed the application of your long range or short range changes to the vast majority of institutions of higher education in this country and in terms of the particular types of programs conceived as Phil Mitterling and the ICSS have conceived recently in ways other than the traditional honors program and the traditional curricula. It may be that the academic world can make these changes and it may not be.

Be that as it may, there is an effort being made, and I think the people who came to the conference will allow me to make a statement. It was really in huge state institutions like the ones represented by Bob Johnson, of Illinois, and Kansas, George Waggoner, and many others, that change is taking place. A lot of small colleges of every type and particular institutions are going as they are going now. There are educational systems such as we have now. It is all very well to say switch. Switch the emphasis toward men in the humanities and women in science and so on. But what I would like to know is how can we turn in terms of your particular insight, constraints and varieties in American higher education? How would you prescribe an obvious effort to make precisely the changes of long-term, short-term such as you advocate?

How would you advise us to go about it? It is my own conviction that the older deal would come. The traditional one has failed to do it because traditional education is utterly a replica of the past, our conception of rigor, and so on, and of the establishment of a male dominated academia. These are the very considerations we are raising at this conference.

But what would you say about that, because I fail to see in your remarks, for all the wisdom and penetration of your points, that I could relate them to the meaningful or meaningless undertaking that is taking place on quite a wide scale, unprecedented before, and in hundreds of institutions that never undertook it before. And this takes me right back to George Waggoner's question. From 1956 and 1957, the ICSS has advocated honors programs beginning in the freshman year. This should be done to provide stimulation, etc. We must face the questions of women and the erosion and dissipation of potential of great ability. And I would like you to make a specific comment on the way we can do these things and all that has been said.

David Riesman: Well that's a larger order than I can fulfill, but I'll say several things that bear both on George Waggoner's question and on your comment and that of our friend from Illinois, Mr. Johnson. And that is that I'm very concrete, even opportunistic about educational innovation. Each is specific to its particular constituency, and I think for instance that the kind of free-wheeling loose seminar that I gave at Harvard, that George Waggoner was referring to, I could do because of what else the students were doing at Harvard (including what I had them do), and if I were teaching in some of the institutions Joe Cohen was just talking about I'd do something else. What it is I'm not sure. I know the end I want in either case, which is that both sexes get out of it feeling they can do more things with more pleasure than when they came in. That they had cased the joint themselves and that they had learned to do new things and that they had enjoyed doing them, and that they feel confident about doing still others. For instance, one thing I also tell my Harvard students is that, whatever else they do, they should write a thesis, even if this means going into a field which is not one in which they are most interested (because the field in which they are more interested may not have a required senior honors thesis). I think this is the most important way in which the student can learn whether he or she can do it and gain the confidence to go on. I urge this because Harvard has its way of eroding talent which, as I've suggested in my earlier remarks, is to convince brilliant students that they are only average. The problem in other institutions may be to convince students who think they are very good because the whole world has smiled on them, including the college, that they can do a great deal more. One of the ways in which I would do this is to use the honors program in the way that George Waggoner I know has done at Kansas, to create an esprit de corps and a high morale in which the students will redefine, what Everett Hughes calls the level of effort that they are willing to make on the academic scene.

Accordingly, it seems to me that one does something very different in a still somewhat indolent environment and one is in a much more difficult condition there in some ways because one doesn't have a captive audience. Everybody has a choice at the University of Illinois, not only the girls. The boys can hole up in their fraternities, and read the canned notes and get a g.p.a. which the system regards as not too bad. Maybe Illinois is doing what I know George Waggoner is doing at Kansas in turning the fraternities into administration vehicles, but I think that's

2

a very mixed blessing and I'm sure he agrees, because it means that the grade becomes the definition of the performance, and this is what above all else one has to get away from in both sexes. The girls are more the victims because as I said earlier, they are less rebellious, they're less players of the game, they are less risk-taking, they are less code-breaking, in this sphere. This doesn't mean they're less courageous. In many other ways girls may be much more courageous, but in the sense of facing social disesteem in the classroom from their faculty or from their fellow "lovely girls" in their sororities they're much more inclined to be pressured.

Here I want to make one recommendation which Joe Cohen may think wildly impractical and maybe it is wildly impractical, but it's the order of frenzy I'm driven to by the question he raised. I begin with the question, what agenda can one find for girls in high school other than sociometry and boys? That is, girls have no hobbies, this is what I meant by my reference to science fiction. They don't mess with old cars, they don't go out for major sports, they haven't got that kind of lone-wolf cameraderie of the boy who goes off with his gun. Maybe they like poetry, one of the few - maybe they read poetry - but on the whole girls have very little to take them away from the almost excessive resonance that they have in our high schools, and in many of our colleges of the sort to which you refer. I don't know how one finds a moral equivalent for boys, for a term in the girl's life so that she can park this interest and one thing I want to suggest, again perhaps wildly impractical, that I kept thinking of in our meetings today is this: can the differential needs of boys and girls be used for differential phasings of their education? One of the things I thought about for instance in general education for boys in our more competitive colleges is to say to them: "All right, don't come into a freshman seminar like Riesman's, because you'll resist it, it's too full of ambivalence, it's too threatening to your early self-definition, and therefore to your early sense of adequacy. It will defend you against your inadequacy but it won't give you a sense of adequacy perhaps; that, you can only get in a field. Enter a field, and again I don't care which, except I hope it isn't what you are going to do when you get to graduate school. Because I don't think any field is eight years deep. Enter a field now, as a freshman, prove yourself in it, and then when you are a senior admitted to graduate school on the basis of your work, stop and shop. Look around, learn something else; you're going to medical school, let's say, or you are going into physics; play an instrument; go abroad; all the different things you might do at this point" - for boys. And then they may possibly, be in too much of a hurry; they may want to get on with it; they may feel that if they are mathematicians they've got to prove themselves by the time they are 25. Maybe, however, you can slow them down then. One of the interesting things incidentally in slowing down, I kept thinking of it today, was during World War II many of us were out of academic life, four, five, six years - men, that is. And on the whole, this did not interfere with the careers of any of my generation, at least those who lived. If women are out for an equivalent length of time they feel, "My God, I haven't kept up with the literature." It [literature] is often a euphemism. And of course it's true that more literature and things stopped during the war, that things are not comparable, but I think it's a good example of social definition, just as the whole business of "part-time" is a social definition. Men work part-time, they call it full-time. Very few men, to go back to Mr. Johnson, very few men have the chance for full intellectual productivity that a woman intellectual has because they are administering, they are going to conferences, they are doing all sorts of house-keeping things of a different sort than the house-keeping things that women are doing. But it's not socially defined as part-time. This makes all the difference in the world. Now then, what would be a comparable definition of adequacy for girls? To find oneself in a field for boys, maybe it is to possess a boy, maybe it is that the girl should go to ... I don't know what. I don't know how this can be staged, legitimately or illegitimately, so that a girl could feel, "I've made it." Maybe she should get married before she goes to college? I think one has to think wildly and speculatively like this, in order to deal with the question of the definition of adequacy particular to the sex, particular to the institution, and the milieux. And here there are just enormous differences, and that's why I would be completely stumped if I tried to respond to Joe Cohen's question. Even Kansas and Illinois are very different cases and I wouldn't generalize about them; I could only talk about the situations I know best.

Lionel Trilling: I want then to raise, I am afraid, a very pessimistic question. One of the old hanging defenses of the 19th century, one of the explanations of why they did not participate or were prevented from participating was that they saw through certain of the games that men indulged in and they were more serious, they were concerned with biological actualities, the depths of life, and though they were charmed by the activities of the world that men indulged in they turned to what was more truly fundamental. And as I look at academic life, intellectual life, generally, but particularly academic life, I wonder whether the satisfactions that it offers are sufficient and sufficiently long lasting to engage the female awareness, the female will. Something has happened in our academic situation which in one way is very wonderful. It seems to me that in the last ten years they are coming at us, speaking now of colleges that employ young men, they are coming at us more and more enormously gifted, very highly trained, beautifully trained young men who are doing all kinds of things that we who were trained 25-35 years ago did with the greatest difficulty. Perhaps they are benefiting from some of the things that we did; this is our way of escaping the concepts of complication. But they are beautifully trained. Then as I look at what is happening in the academic life, let us say the humanities, chiefly, which is what I know, I see an enormous facility and at the end of a relatively short career of this facility, I see often a sense of terrible bleakness and dissatisfaction of failure of life. It seems to me that the man, let's say of 40, reaches a kind of achievement beyond which he does not go, the techniques have been given to him, the formulations are available to him very quickly, and then he has made them and he does not finally find, he has not geared himself as an intellectual into actuality of any real kind in dealing with what is academic in the honorific sense and then turns out to be academic in the pejorative sense. It's very interesting for other scholars to read and finally is doing nothing with the reality of life. And it seems to me as I watch men younger than myself, but no longer quite young, this is happening. Again and again they have been brilliant, they know a great deal, they have fought very vivaciously up to a point and it has meant nothing to them and as I think what it is that one is inviting women into, it is this: it is a world of status, prestige, we are inviting you to this new profession, it is now an enormous profession it seems to me, a world of teachers of English is just infinite, and one writes for them or writes novels for them, poetry, but teachers of English die early, spiritually. I think what is it we are doing when we say to women: come into this thing or come into the historical discipline or perhaps you would say the same to sociological professions, and I think that one has to ask a great question about the culture. What is happening, what is meant by intellectual activity and intellectual seriousness which we are not defining because what we are doing is saying to women "You too can be part of it, you too can be technicians of one kind or another," It's not quite enough to invite them into, I think they have a right to say, "Look, I'm dealing with my husband who is 40 or 45 and he's in a very bad situation and there's no reason why I should have go into that." This makes me very troubled. When you speak of undergraduates, I think it is superb, they must be made to feel themselves an equal of the men. When it comes to going into intellectual professions which I think are representative of this group, then I get very worried about it and I ought to say that I've long felt that women, that married women, ought to be scholars, pre-scholars, not involved with universities, but when I think of it as a committed career I worry very much about what these women are going to feel at their point of fortyish. And I wonder what you want to say about that because it does involve what I think you people look at, deal with the whole conspectus, the whole tone of our culture at this moment in which there is to be sure a kind of enormous burst of feeling for the intellectual life, the academic life. I don't think that any culture ever had it in this way and yet, if you look at it from a certain point of view, all this is very dry hay in the mouth after a certain point. I think that's my question and it's terrible.

David Riesman: Both Lionel Trilling and I prefer to teach undergraduates for reasons implicit in what he just said. I think one way of beginning to respond to this is for me to say that one of the reasons I want to invite women into the academic is to make it less academic and more intellectual and more concrete. That is, I have a very personal stake in this because I don't like stag cultures as I've already made clear. I don't like stag parties, and I consider much of what we find in our academic life as stag parties of high preciousness rather than low vulgarity. I don't care for either. I agree entirely with Lionel Trilling's estimate of what has happened in the society which has now turned out enough academic people to be their own industry. This is the first time this has happened. It is simply true that intradisciplinary guerrilla warfare is wholy self-justifying and preoccupying in most of the big fields. I might say incidentally that one of the things I say to many girls I see is "major in a small department. I don't care what." I see lots of girls at Radcliffe in English and history, huge fields, they always complain of lack of access to faculty, and they have more of that lack of access than boys do; and I say, "Look, why don't you get into the Middle Eastern studies where the teachers out-number the students," partly because it is not yet subjected to this kind of staking off to quite the same degree and partly because, to the extent that it is, the girl who is in there can have her chance at it too.

That's not a fundamental answer, the more fundamental anser is to make a necessary distinction, and I'm grateful to Lionel for helping me make it, between games and playfulness: the distinction to which Lois Langland referred in one of our sessions when she spoke about the problem of playfulness being similar in both sexes at the very top. At the very highest level, there aren't those great differences. Girls flirt with ideas as well as with boys at that level. And boys flirt with girls as well as with ideas at that level, one hopes. This kind of playfulness is not gamesmanship, because it's not competitive, and if it's competitive, it's against the givenness of the material rather than against the other people involved with the material. It's playful in the sense of enjoying the competence of one's own intellectual operation and discussion. It's not gamesmanship in the sense of putting people down in Stephen Potter's sense of gamesmanship. Many men in our culture move from solemnity to frivolity with no intermediate stop. Many women in our culture (andin ways suggested in the story to which Diana Trilling did not give the prize) move easily to a kind of grimness. And this, it seems to me, on the intellectual, non-academic side, this grimness is dehydrating very much in the way that the academic that Lionel just described is dehydrating. One of the ways to bring the juices of life back is to bring in women, more of them. Just as one of the ways to bring the juices of life into the elementary school would be for each of us, I am speaking of myself, taking a Peace Corps turn in such a school for a couple of years in the course of becoming a university professor. This is one of my answers, incidentally, to the question Lionel Trilling raised: to change careers. It's not necessary to stay in the same one, but to move in and out. Girls do this because of their opportunity, as Mr. Johnson put it, to get married. Men can do it in other ways. I think there should be much more opportunity for this kind of sabbatical experience, sabbatical lasting maybe seven years, than we now have opportunity for in a potentially rich society.

The other theme that I want to mention in response to what was just said is how to reconnect academia with the world. I think that the umbilical cord had to be cut in our very pragmatic society and that academia had to become autonomous and self-generating, and now we see the vices of that accomplishment and that victory. And again, it's not a victory, Joe Cohen, which has occurred everywhere as you know very well. It's a victory still to be won in many parts of the country, many fundamentalist parts of the country. But it is a victory which is on the way to being won, just as the literary culture is on the way to domination as Diana Trilling described it last night, although as Virginia Frobes of Utah said, there are many many enclaves where the books haven't hit yet or where they have hit as the doings of people on some other planet which is entertaining but not relevant. How do we connect academia with the world? I want to say what I think should be done in the humanities, and I'd be surprised if Lionel and Diana Trilling would agree with me. What I would like to see the humanities tackle now is popular culture. I would like to see professors of English teaching their students to go out into our secondary schools and some of our colleges and prepare to start with the level of culture to which their students have been addicted when they come. The first meeting should be comic books and the second reading should be pornography and the third should be the Steve Allen Show last night brought into the classroom and discussed in terms of the rhetoric of the Elizabethan theatre. And the next work of the humanities teacher should be the sculpture of hot-rodding and after that he should teach the visual landscape of the classroom, of the city, of the car, of the parking lot, go to the New York World's Fair. This is what I would like to see as the curriculum of the humanities connected with where the constituency in large part is. But I can't imagine professors of English, who have trained themselves often in their own social mobility to move away, going back to earlier tastes with anything but revulsion. I'm terribly aware of all the problems that it would involve, of condescension. I'm also terribly aware of how enormously imaginative and playful one would have to be to do it, so it wouldn't be just doing again in the classroom what the kids did for five hours the night before - only with an academic excuse. This is one of the many ways in which I would try to reconnect the humanities (and the social sciences in similar ways) with the world. I feel for instance at Harvard, and Joe Cohen was pointing to this obliquely, gently, that I live in a university which is located in a non-community. I don't feel that there is any connection with Cambridge. I'm as guilty here as anyone else. Or with Boston, or with Massachusetts or with the University of Massachusetts. With any of the public or private institutions in the state, other than itself and MIT. And I feel that this connection with the community which came in with the land-grant tradition has been broken even there. I was talking at supper with Mr. Mitterling and with Mr. Weir about how at Southern Illinois University, an institution which had a local constituency, the new hot-shot faculty of just the type Lionel Trilling is talking about and his colleagues are producing are coming and taking the institution out of the orbit of Southern Illinois and putting it on the planetary map along with all the other institutions now on the planetary map. And George Waggoner of Kansas has a hell of a time with the dialectic between Kansas and the planet. And he plays it very well. And yet, this is the issue on which the academic needs to be recreated by contact with what is real. And I agree with Lionel Trilling that girls have this sense of what is real: they can lose it, just as we do, they can regain it just as we can, and I want them back in academic life. I want them more in academic life to save us from the kind of vanities about which we talk.

Lois E. Langland: I just want to say that if some women could choose where they would want to experience their disillusionment, they might decide they'd just as soon experience it in the university subculture.

PLENARY SESSION

"Problems of Research: Data Sources and Design Difficulties"

E. Lowell Kelly, Psychology, University of Michigan

Paul A. Heist, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH: DESIGN DIFFICULTIES

E. Lowell Kelly

On being invited to speak to you, I, too, had some misgivings particularly since I have not been doing research in this specific area. I wondered whether I should accept, but since the group that was coming was such an interesting one, I decided that if you were willing to take a chance on what I might have to say, I would run the risk of saying it.

I found this assignment an extremely challenging one. I was told that Paul Heist was going to talk on data sources and I was going to talk on problems of research design. The more I began to think about what I would say, the more difficulty I had in trying to outline my remarks. I wasn't even sure about what kind of talent was being referred to. There are many other kinds of talent than those we happen to value in colleges of liberal arts. I suppose that each of us is most interested in the kinds of talent that it takes to make grades in our own courses. I was also told that I would not be talking to researchers, that I should talk about these technical problems in terms that a layman could understand. In other words, I have the challenging assignment of talking about undefined problems in lay language on issues not very clearly delineated!

I have long been interested in matters of sex differences. It was my pleasure to be associated with Terman and Miles in the famous Stanford sex difference research some thirty years ago and I have also been much interested in following the careers of some 300 married couples over the last 25 years with respect to how these men and women differ as well as in how they paired off and how they have changed over the years. During World War II, I was concerned with the selection of pilots and for that short time only had no professional concern with women. Back at the university after the War, I was particularly concerned with our graduate program in psychology and became fascinated with the problems of selecting graduate students and what to do about women applicants and women graduate students. We are in the very fortunate position at the University of Michigan of having several hundred applications for graduate work each year and we take only about 50. This selection ratio permits us to select very talented persons. We pride ourselves on having no quota--in-state, out-of-state, religion, color--or sex. The result is that we always get a fairly good number of very bright young women beginning graduate work in the department each year. But when we note how many of them eventually get their Ph.D.'s, it's a very discouraging picture by virtue of the number who fall by the wayside, not academically--but who, either because of marriage or change of motivation don't complete their Ph.D. requirements.

This led the staff to wonder whether we dared to continue to admit women without a concern for the probability of their actually utilizing the resources which we have to offer in graduate training. Furthermore, as I indicated to you this morning, we were disappointed at being unable to place some of our ablest women Ph.D.'s in the better academic institutions. Thus, I have had a continuing concern with the problem of the able woman student.

I have also had the privilege of participating in the establishment of our honors program at Michigan, and just this last year I had the fun and gratification for the first time of teaching a beginning honors section in psychology. I enjoyed it and the students enjoyed it. Whether or not we accomplished anything by way of education I am not sure.

I think it would be unfair if I didn't indicate to you that I have some rather strong biases which will probably show throught my remarks. I trust that I am not biased with respect to the relative abilities of men and women. Such evidence as I have with respect to such differences leads me to believe that they are very real--some of them are biologically determined but neither sex has the right to look down on the other. Although men excel in some things, women excel in others. It all depends on one's value system and one's point of view as to who is the superior.

I pride myself on thinking that men are not superior in general to women or vice versa. And yet I cannot overlook the fact that ours is very definitely a masculine culture in which the norms are established by men and the criteria for evaluating performance are established by men. I think this state of affairs has resulted, as I indicated in my comments this morning, in a kind of an insidious discrimination as pervasive as that toward the Negro and more insidious because it's not as overt. I think we do a terrible thing to the young women in our society by pretending that they have equal opportunities when they in fact do not have equal opportunities. It's bad enough for the girls in high school, but it's far worse for the ones who go to college when we don't tell them frankly that they are going to have much difficulty competing on the masculine scene for the jobs in which prizes go to men. If they do get jobs, they will get second class jobs. They will be second class citizens and they will be employed at salaries considerably less than their counterparts in the male sex. Some of the problems that have been discussed here grow out of the fact that some of the ablest women perceive this state of affairs and consequently quit striving.

Last semester I spoke with a young lady who had graduated fourth or fifth in a high school class of 500, was admitted to our honors program, but made only B's and C's and was dropped from honors. She could have easily made an A+ in my beginning statistics course. I talked with her and tried to persuade her that maybe she ought to try a little harder and she said, "Why?" I began to have difficulty answering her question. I found that she was not wasting her time. In fact, she was enjoying life rather thoroughly in college--not over-socialized but just going through college in a very relaxed fashion. I'm sure she will get the kind of husband she wants and may be less unhappy than if she had stiven for a job which she would not have been able to get.

In my opinion, we won't see any major change in the situation without a major social revolution, one that affects women of all levels of ability. In the USSR some 70% of the physicians are women, but there are also a very large number of women working as street sweepers, miners and common laborers. I doubt that we can continue to maintain the fiction of women being protected and placed upon a pedestal, and at the same time equalize the opportunities for only the more talented among them.

I wonder if the problem of the utilization of talent among women is not in large part a function of the fact that our culture is not prepared to utilize some of the greatest strengths and talents of women simply because we have not yet been able to equate them with making money. Perhaps as we move into the brave new world with automation displacing such large numbers of persons and after we relax our protestant ethic and recognize that we must pay people money for doing "unuseful" things--that then and then only will we begin to repect those activities that women can carry out better than men. If it is true that in the not too distant future most of/our population will be able to live a life of leisure something like the English gentry of the nineteenth century, then perhaps women with talent will be better accepted and appreciated on our social scene.

So much for my personal biases. Let us now turn to some of the problems of research in this area.

First of all, I wonder what kind of research are we considering. Are we talking about action research, which is primarily to make changes in the system, or about basic research designed to find truth? I am afraid I did not ask our moderator and I am not sure he would have answered the question if I had asked him, because I perceive we are interested in both approaches. We would like to know what the facts are with respect to women in our culture. But we also, I think, have certain ideas as to how practices should be improved. I warn you, however, that any time we begin action research--i.e., limited research to demonstrate a point or to convince somebody that a change in practice should be made, we are very apt to carry on our research with built-in biases. Such research is not apt to be good research.

For the last several years I have served as a member of a review panel concerned with accident prevention research. This is a very heterogeneous field. Many people have ideas on how accidents could be reduced but it is a field without a basic scientific discipline. Many of the proposals which we received for reducing accidents were essentially not research proposals in which the proponent wanted to find the truth, but proposals which would give the applicant the opportunity to demonstrate that his idea was right.

I will assume that we are interested in finding out new scientific truths--propositions which have generality in this whole field of sex differences because we really want to know how to arrange for a better state of affairs in society. Let me say at once that we are going to find such research extremely difficult. Sex difference research is essentially a part of the larger question of heredity versus environment--or nature-nurture research--which has proven to be one of the most complicated problems that scientists have yet undertaken.

This problem of the relative effect of nature and nurture is much more difficult in the human than in the animal field, for a variety of reasons. First we are not permitted to carry out selective breeding among humans. Secondly, we usually don't have any major control over human environments. Thirdly, the culture is so much more manifold, multiplex, and complex, than it is for the animal. Fourthly, the human lifespan is so long that one researcher doesn't have time to study very many generations and so new information in the whole field of human genetics has developed very slowly. And it would have developed even more slowly if it were not for the fact that nature has given us certain fortuitous, adventitious experimental situations on which we have been able to capitalize. I refer to the occasional set of twins that are born, and to the fact that identical twins have identical heredity, whereas fraternal twins are no more related genetically than ordinary siblings--they just happened to be born at the same time. By taking advantage of twinning, the fact that there are these two kinds of twins, and the fact that occasionally both kinds of twins are separated at birth and reared apart, we have a set of "natural experiments;" that is, we can study identical twins reared in the same home or reared apart, fraternal twins reared in the same home, reared apart, etc. There are about a dozen such natural experimental situations which have given us much information about the relative weighting of nature and nurture in producing human characteristics. If it had not been for the fortunate accident of twinning we would be far more ignorant in this domain.

Unfortunately, this method is of no value when it comes to doing research on sex differences. Although sex is an hereditary characteristic--one of the most basic ones, we cannot utilize the twin experiment in sex difference research because identical twins are always of the same sex. And consequently, the beautiful potential experimental situation is not available.

Equally important, we have, as we move into the domain in which we are interested, the problem of what variables to measure. What are the characteristics that interest us most? I've already raised the question, what is talent? How many kinds of talents? More generally, we are faced with the fact that the things we can measure easiest are in general things that interest us least. For example, it is easily possible to go out and take a bunch of physical and anthropological measures on men and women. It has been done. We know these things well. But somehow or other they are not very intriguing.

When we turn to psychological variables: personality characteristics, motivations, temperament and things of this sort--we are dealing with variables which we cannot measure directly but must infer from behavior. Consequently, our measures are must less well developed, and typically they are not applicable in infancy when measures are most critically needed before environmental differences have had a chance to get in their licks. Frequently these measures themselves are often sex biased because they have been built by males. If you want to know what I mean here, imagine what intelligence tests would be like if they were developed by African primitives who place heavy emphasis on the kinds of perceptual sensitivity involved in hunting and who value as little as they do some of the things that we think are important by way of intellectual activity.

In the same way, we have pretty good evidence that our present intelligence tests are culture biased in favor of the middle and upper classes. We also have pretty good evidence that they are sex biased. In addition to this we have the possibility that by the time we start presenting test stimuli to children--that is after they are able to read and react--they may have already reacted differently to the differential training given to boys and girls in our society so that what seems like the same measure obtained for men and for women may actually not have the same meaning at all. Perhaps the best example of this is the need achievement measure developed by McClelland and Adkins. This is an effort to infer on the basis of stories told in response to fairly unstructured pictures an individual's motivation to achieve. It just so happens that McClelland and Adkins started working on this research at Wesleyan. If they had been at Bryn Mawr they would have probably thrown it out because they have never yet been able to get their need achievement measure to work for women! Their results have been replicated many times for male groups in male colleges and for male students in coed colleges but never for women either in women's colleges or in coed institutions. There seems to be something about our culture which results in women developing a different set of attitudes toward the need to achieve in our society (or in its reflection in fantasy stories). The result is this technique which provides a relatively good measure for one sex is totally inapplicable for the other.

Here is another example: A few years ago we had a graduate student who had worked better than a year collecting data on his doctoral dissertation andnone of his hypotheses were being confirmed as he analyzed the data. Somebody suggested that he maybe ought to break down the data and analyze separately by male subjects and female subjects. When he did this, he discovered very clear cut findings for one sex but not for the other. In this particular case, he was using nickels as rewards for right answers and shocks as punishment for wrong answers. Apparently shock meant something entirely different to women--maybe nickels did, too. At any rate, something wasn't working the same for the two sexes.

It is likely that this state of affairs applies with respect to a number of other psychological variables. Because of our desire to avoid discrimination on the basis of sex, we have tended to emphasize the smallness of the real differences between men and women. It is likely that in many instances where researchers might well have broken their data down and analyzed it separately by sex, it either never occurred to them to do it or perhaps they thought it might even be immoral to do so! Actually, we cannot afford, henceforth, to not break down all of our data analyses separately by the sexes. With present day computers it is always possible to compute two means or two correlations just about as fast as one and two factor analyses rather than one. I shall be surprised if we do not find many instances in which although the sexes may not differ in terms of means or averages, they will differ markedly in terms of the interactions amongst a group of variables.

So far I have been speaking of the variables on which we might assess our subjects. I now turn to the question: "What criteria shall we use?" I have already raised the question of what we mean when we use the word "talent." Obviously, we are referring to the ability to make grades in our courses but I'm not at all sure how important this is. As a matter of fact almost any group of university professors will tell you how grades are not really very important--that they are sure that the results of their teaching result in changes in the individual which are not reflected in grades. Why do we insist at the same time in giving so much weight to these grades in determining who gets scholarships and who gets recommended for graduate school and so on?

But grades are with us and I am afraid if anything we tend to overemphasize them as a single criterion. Grades are important at the student level. When we get to the staff level, it is publication rate. However, available evidence suggests a rather low correlation between grades in college and productivity in science. And in scientific productivity, are we interested in the number of articles or the quality of articles? There is no necessary correlation between these!

In defining the talented woman, maybe we ought to broaden our conception of talent to include such criteria as overall health--both mental and physical. Perhaps the number--or the quality--of children that a woman has is a very important talent that we ought not to overlook. Maybe the individual's ability to contribute to groups--whether they be family groups, societal groups, social, community or political groups--maybe these are talents that we ought to weigh rather heavily.

As suggested above, I'm doubtful regarding the desirability of minimizing the sex differences and the differentiation of sex roles in our society. Much of our talking and thinking suggests that since the sex differences are minimal, we should minimize them still further and consequently develop one nice group of people of the neuter sex! At least I think this is what I infer from the kind of thinking we were engaged in this morning. But, perhaps the perpetuation of sex differences is a good thing. Perhaps we need to redefine the sex roles and select for honors programs those women who can best perpetuate or even enhance the best differentiating characteristics of the sexes rather than who can best compete with men in terms of mathematical, scientific ability and creative activity.

I do not pretend to have firm answers to the questions I have just raised, but a recognition of the issues forces us to consider some very basic value questions. We seem to be concerned because girls do not get Ph.D's as often, do not get on college faculties as often or do not produce scientific publications as often. Let us suppose--just for fun--that we knew enough to change the situation and could produce the kind of analytical abilities, the kind of motivations, whatever it would take for women to begin to compete or even excel in the general area of scientific performance. Suppose, however, that this were accomplished at the cost of reducing perceptibly the sexual attractiveness of men and women for each other. Is this a price we would be willing to pay? Suppose alternately that we could somehow erase sex differences to the point where women could successfully compete in all arenas: but in so doing, that we would increase the anxiety of their children by a palpable amount. Would we be willing to pay this price?

I am not suggesting that such dire results would necessarily follow, but I think we have to be prepared as we plan research in this area to consider alternate criteria in assessing the impact of such changes as we might want to introduce into educational practice.

So far I have been talking pretty much about approaches to basic research, some of it even pretty far fetched. Let me make it clear that I think that local research, more limited research, is needed in all situations where we are experimenting with honors work, whether we are concerned primarily with men or with women. However, I think it is extremely important that we collect data more systematically than is usually done so that we know what is going on in our local situation and at least can ask ourselves, do we like what we find? As I have already indicated, I think we need to keep our data separate for the sexes. I think, with Paul Heist, that it is terribly important we remember the regional, cultural and subcultural, institutional differences. Somebody has well said there is a college for every kind of individual in these United States. There are colleges for bright people and for dull people and for intellectual people and artistic people and so on and I doubt that there is any college that is good for everybody. But in making comparisons it is very important that we pool data only if they are in comparable form and from comparable institutions. And here I would emphasize as Paul Heist did that the institutions may seem to be comparable on the surface and yet not be at all. A fascinating study by John Holland examined the correlates of course grades in two well-know eastern institutions, both of them selecting very able male students of about the same level of measured ability. Yet every personality variable that correlated positively with grades in one institution correlated negatively with grades in the other institution! Apparently, the two institutions were characterized by very different atmospheres and a different set of expectations with respect to the amount of dependence and authority and creativity and other dimensions that are expected in student behavior.

I would like to suggest that if we really want answers to the kinds of questions we have been raising today, we are going to need to plan long term projects. Dependable new knowledge of the sort in which we are interested is not something that will result from a one-year study in a given college or one year in a specific honors program. In most instances we are interested in the long range payoff. So we need to plan longitudinal studies--very carefully identifying the variables on which we are going to assess students and the criterion variables in which we are going to evaluate them later. We need to be very careful about the sampling of students in institutions and to plan for control groups of non-honors students of both sexes. We must be prepared to deal with what is a very messy multivariate situation in which no single comparison of means or no single simple correlation between two variables is going to give us answers of the sort we want. We are going to have to introduce statistical control via very elaborate statistical design. Frankly, I am afraid of what I would call mid-level research in which somebody does what he believes to be basic research in a local situation and generalizes too much from his results based on a local situation, with limited numbers of variables and subjects. Such research cannot but yield fragmental, partial and probably contradictory findings from one investigation to another. Such research results will be used by individuals to support their own previous biased assumptions regarding the state of affairs that they would like to believe is true, but in the long run do not add to our understanding and knowledge.

As an indication of the extreme complexity of a problem of sex differences, I would like to quote a series of findings summarized in an excellent paper by a very capable woman psychologist, Eleanor Maccoby, a paper that she gave at the University of California Medical School conference on the kinds of problems we are considering here. (Ref.: Maccoby, Eleanor E. Women's Intellect, in The Potential of Women, edited by Farber and Wilson, McGraw-Hill, 1963.)

This was one of the most worthwhile papers I came across in my search for background material. In this paper, Dr. Maccoby undertakes to examine the basic differences in the intellect of men and women. For a long time we pretended that there were no differences. As a matter of fact, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test was standardized using test items which did not show such differences. If sex differences occurred in the items these were excluded on the grounds that it would be necessary to develop two sets of norms. Consequently we had a situation in which such sex differences as did exist in mental functioning tended to be covered up. As we have become more willing to examine the situation certain rather clear cut sex differences in intellectual functioning appear.

There is a tendency for girls to get off to a more rapid start--they develop a little more quickly, talk a little sooner, have bigger vocabularies age for age. And girls are not inferior in the computational skills which are taught in the early grades. It is not until high school that we begin to get quite consistent sex differences with the boys forging ahead when they come to analytical geometry, trigonometry, algebra, in general doing better in tests involving quantitative reasoning. By the time the scholastic aptitude tests are administered for admission to college we find boys on the average scoring about 50 points higher on the College Board Math tests and the girls tending to score 8 to 10 points higher on the verbal or language portion of the test.

Now these are differences which most of us have had an opportunity to observe. Although not of tremendous magnitude, they tend to be reflected in strong preferences, both boys and girls, for certain kinds of courses and sex differences in the attitudes toward different kinds of courses. The question is, why do these sex differences occur? It has long been assumed that these preferences for courses and sex differences in grades in the courses is primarily a function of the fact that math and the math related sciences are obviously propaedeutic to going into certain "male professions," e.g., engineering, medicine, etc. Consequently, girls who saw themselves as unfitted for these occupations did not tend to move toward acquiring proficiency in mathematics and analytic thinking.

Dr. Maccoby calls attention in her paper to the possibility and even the probability that these differences are developed in early childhood and grow out of differential attitudes of parents toward their children. Let me give you some of the evidence. I do so not only because of its intrinsic interest but because it points up the extreme complexity of the problem which we are considering.

It turns out that, in whole series of studies, girls have been found to be what we psychologists call more "field dependent." For example, consider a test involving a series of numbers--if I say 2,4,6,8 immediately you know which number is next and if I say 2,4,8,16,32 you know what to say next because the numbers are being doubled. But then suppose I throw in a ringer. Since we are in New York, suppose I say 14, 23, 34, 42 and so on--these being the stops on the Broadway subway. For some reason or other men are able to make such shifts of sets better than women.

Witkins' work on perception of the vertical involves a vertical illuminated rod inside a kind of picture frame which is also illuminated. The task consists of asking subjects to set this rod in a vertical position even though the frame may be tilted (and sometimes the seats they are sitting on are also tilted). In general, girls are much more likely to be affected by the tilt of the frame and adjust the rod to this field rather than respond to the verticality of the larger world.

Greater field dependency of girls has been shown in a number of other studies. Kagan has developed a test in which children are presented an array of pictures showing a variety of objects and told simply to group them in the way they seem to belong together. Girls are more likely to use what Kagan calls functional grouping, that is, they will put together a picture of a doctor and a nurse and a wheelchair all because they are concerned with taking care of peole. By contrast, boys are more apt to use an analytic approach and group the pictures on the basis of some common characteristic of the people or objects--common item of dress, common stance, or some other common element.

Why do some people develop more analytic modes of thinking and others a tendency to avoid an analytical approach? Here we can move outside the domain of sex differences. An early study by David Levy was among the first to suggest the importance of independence training for intellectual functioning. Levy studied a group of boys whom he characterized as "overprotected." These were boys whose mothers had really mothered them--including leading them to school by the hand at the age of 10 or 11. On tests these boys were found to be very superior in verbal skills but extremely poor in mathematics!

Recently Dr. Maccoby and her associates at Stanford studied a group of children who were good at verbal tasks but poor at math or spatial tasks and contrasted them with children who were on the other extremes. Mothers of these chidlren were asked to give their children some problems to work on and observers noted how much the mothers became involved as the child worked with the problem. There was clear evidence that the mothers of the highly verbal girls were intrusive, that is, they offered suggestions, praised the child for performing well, criticized her for performing poorly. By contrast, the mothers of the girls who were best at math or spatial tasks left their daughters alone to solve the problems by themselves.

Witkins, who developed the tilted frame test, also compared the life history of children who were more or less field dependent than others. He found that the children who are field dependent, i.e., tend to be influenced by the position of the frame, are also the ones who are poor in math and in general are children who have been encouraged by their parents to be very dependent. Children who are field independent tend to be better at math and to have been encouraged to be much more independent at home!

Still another study points forcefully to the probably relationship between early child rearing practices and sex differences in intellectual functioning. Plank and Plank studied the biographies of a small group of famous women mathematicians and noted one important element common to autobiographies of all of these exceptional women. They all reported an unusually close relationship with their fathers and an attempt to pattern themselves after their fathers rather than their mothers.

Finally, in one more study at Stanford, Dr. Maccoby reports on a selected group of fifth grade girls who were especially good at arithmetical or spatial tests. She found that these girls, too, were somewhat more masculine, more aggressive than other girls with similar total I.Q.'s, rather withdrawn from social contacts with their age mates. In general, they were much closer to their fathers, much more often disciplined by their fathers and so on.

Thus it looks as if these often observed sex differences in perceptual and intellectual functioning of children are very closely associated with the child rearing practices of parents, which are in turn culturally determined. Furthermore, they seem to be remarkably widespread. The fact that may of these sex differences (e.g., in field dependence) have been found in cross-cultural studies from New York City to Hong Kong suggests that they may also have a genetic basis with further differentiation resulting from differential child rearing practices.

Finally, Dr. Maccoby raises an even more challenging question regarding the possible state of affairs which leads to low scientific productivity even among highly selected girls given excellent training. A study of 400 Ph.D.'s from Radcliffe revealed a rather sorry picture of scientific productivity of these highly selected and well trained women. Of course, it is easy to say that it was because of marriage, family and children. It turns out, however, when a comparison was made of those who had family responsibilities and those who did not have any family responsibilities, the latter group had not produced any more than those with family responsibilities.

In the paper to which I have referred several times, Dr. Maccoby suggests that perhaps in order to compete in this competitive (masculinely dominated) world, girls have to grow up primarily as deviants, as tomboys. Then as they grow into adolescence and finally into adulthood they are much more plagued by anxiety than girls who conformed early to the ways of living that little girls are supposed to follow. Consequently, the ablest of women, those potentially more able to produce scientifically, are unfortunately handicapped by excessive levels of anxiety which keep them from being as productive and as creative as otherwise might be the case.

I am sure that Dr. Maccoby would not want me to suggest that this conclusion is necessarily the correct one. But it is a challenging possibility. I wanted to bring her findings to your attention to emphasize the great complexity of the issues which we raise when we ask the simple question: Why don't our able girls stay in the honors program and become intellectually productive when they graduate?

RESEARCH ON TALENTED WOMEN: PROBLEMS OF APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE SOURCES OF DATA

Paul A. Heist

Introduction

It seems appropriate to preface my remarks with a brief description of the frame-of-reference that I bring to the topic of "research on the education of talented women." My present perspective is determined, to a great degree, by some of the findings from a long range study on college students presently being completed at the Center for the Study of Higher Education in Berkeley. I mention this, in introduction, since I will later be addressing myself to education at the college level as a natural and logical area for the study of talent.

One implication that can be drawn from the findings mentioned is that significant, meaningful research on talented women, leading to decisive answers and generalizations, is difficult to execute and the "telling" data are not readily obtained. One of the simplest reasons for this, among a number, is that the college women identified as the most talented and the most creative are frequently no longer around at the end of four years of college. At least they are not in the school of their initial enrollment. Consequently, one is not able to complete the essential post-assessment for many subjects. The talented students that do remain to complete a degree have, with few exceptions, been receiving an education in institutions that tend not to further the identifiable talents or creative potential of the students.[1] An exception to the latter point is, of course, found in academic achievement, but it can be sincerely questioned how much in the way of special talents is usually involved in this kind of attainment. Thus, in brief, the educational setting, seemingly a natural place to study the development of talent, has not facilitated the adequate collection of important information. In further research, this concern will demand some attention regarding the choice of particular schools, in order to study a full range of talent and ability, and some attention to program and procedures within schools, to make certain that a larger proportion of the most exceptional persons remain to graduate.

---

[1] Some will object to this statement and call attention to the great number of institutions that are stressing literature, the arts and dance in the curriculum for women. The reply to this conjecture is to ask about the evidence which would indicate that such special training has any effective carry-over in the lives of 90 to 95 percent who received it, or about the carry-over value of much of the rest of the curricular experiences, for that matter, whatever the ability and talent of the young women.

A second implication from the general findings of the studies to date, which supplements my present frame-of-reference, is centered in the social context in which most young women receive an education. It seems like calling attention to the obvious to state that an education for most students is obtained in a heterosexual setting and seemingly naive to point out that this is the reality of our total existence. But, the point to be made briefly is that the education of talented women, and less talented women for that matter, is attempted, even in the present day, in a heterosexual but predominantly male world. In numerous ways, according to the information obtained from women interviewees on various campuses, much of their thinking, motivation and aspirations are too much oriented around the males immediately present and by their anticipation of an existence with a male or males in their future. This takes on a negative connotation as it implies limited horizons, uncertain objectives, a constrained way-of-life, and too little personal freedom of operation. For the majority, the possibilities of an optimum education become even more curtailed as women students reach the last two years in college. (This conclusion is also substantiated by the research findings of Esther Matthews.)[2]

A second aspect of this heterosexual, social context is centered in the male students and reflected in their way of accepting women and their general relations with them. A mass of college men have a perspective of the coeds that isn't far removed from that of the military man. This can most tactfully be presented by saying that women per se are seen as the second sex, not too unlike the perception of minority groups as viewed by a prevailing majority. This matter of not quite or never "being" an equal becomes part of the perceived inhibiting environment in which a young woman's behavior and development is always somewhat bounded by how she is seen and received as a group member, or how she thinks she and other women are seen and received.

Research at the college level has also led us to question the completeness of our frames-of-reference for assessing and evaluating certain student behavior and attainments. Upon taking a second and third look at the criteria or standards of achievement we find that they appear to have a masculine bias and may often be inappropriately applied to women, especially since the aspirations and objectives, not to overlook the emotional make-up, of the two sexes are dissimilar. There is reason to believe that this fact may be as damaging to the fruition of talent in innovative, imaginative women as is the matter of not identifying or never becoming aware of students' strengths and potentials.

---

[2] Matthews, Esther. The Marriage-Career Conflict in the Career Development of Girls and Young Women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University 1960.

A second aspect of this concern about criteria centers in the quality of achievement determined by male behavior as the naturally assumed standard of goodness. There is ample reason to question that most gifted or talented males are performing at their potential level of competence or that they are being educated to use their talent. On this basis, research on the topic demands a more careful look at the identifying characteristics of talent and at the matter of relevant performance criteria.

An Orientation to Guide the Collection of Essential Data

Presumably most educators have some common understanding of what is meant when we speak of studying and educating talented, gifted and creative persons. And a number may be so bold as to indicate that they are capable of distinguishing among the specific characteristics of persons described by these three terms. Actually the differences are as often a matter of definition as of fact, and they are not an uppermost consideration here. The general point is the identification and education of students and adults who possess either special talents or superior ability or both. The orientation here will include an approach to questions and to sources of data that apply to studying all exceptional women.

What are the blueprints, if any, or what are the guidelines for studying the talented so that we may arrive at information and data fundamental to promoting their optimum education, their contributions to society and their own welfare?

For purposes of easy communication, the "guidelines" have been stated in the form of questions. The underlying focus is the possible effectiveness of college experiences in bringing potential talent to a state of fruition or realization, whether immediately or eventually. This bounding by the college years may be seen as too specific and limiting, and as the questions will indicate, any search for adequate answers will demand going beyond this post-adolescent period. In this vein, the context of honors programs would likewise be an insufficient setting for research on the talented. Even if the criteria for selection or admissions into an honors program resulted only in a highly superior or talented group, an investigation of the "true" effectiveness of programs and experience would have to extend beyond honors work and the college years. In this sense it is very advisable that educators and researchers become cognizant of the pre-college lives and backgrounds of students and, more important, also study, at a later date, the eventual activities and pursuits of those having experienced a particular approach or curriculum. Thus, we are introducing and indirectly making a plea for long-range or longitudinal studies as an important "design" consideration in investigations of talented people.

The questions are presented in outline form, subdivided under the terms "general" and "subsidiary." They are chiefly illustrative, not to be construed as all-inclusive of the many points and considerations relevant to the topic. The two general questions are non-temporal in that they apply to any time in a life sequence, from the early pre-adolescent years to mature adulthood.

A. General Questions

1. What general factors or circumstances, presumably affecting the majority of women, facilitate or prevent the attainment of satisfactory levels of achievement and contributive involvement for (most) talented women in our society?

2. What specific factors facilitate or prevent the attainment of satisfactory levels of achievement and contributive involvement for the individual woman of ability and talent or certain types of talented women?

B. Some Subsidiary Questions

1. What are the characteristics and orientations acquired in the pre-college years that serve as predeterminants of aspirations, social and occupational directions, and general development and also facilitate the expression and utilization of talent and creative potential?

2. What are the significant pre-college experiences and what are the essential stages, if any, in

psychological development that predispose the later expression of ability and talent?

3. What are the variations in educational records and the patterns of realization for the students identified as talented--during the college years?--in the post-college years?

   a. How do different colleges compare in their education of women of high ability and talent?

   b. How do colleges compare in their attempts to effectively educate different types of talented women (e.g., those with musical talent compared with those possessing exceptional quantitative ability)?

   c. What is the impact of different (selected) experiences for talented women within any college (e.g., the effect of honors work, independent study, or course work in the humanities or creative arts)?

   d. What percentage of talented women never complete the requirements for a college degree and how does this affect their future activities and attainments?

4. What are the variations in educational records (e.g., in the way of continuing education) and patterns of realization in the post-college years for talented women students who withdraw from college and do not complete the requirements for an undergraduate degree?

5. How do the attitudes, interests and activities of college women graduates with talent compare with those of the less talented three, five and ten years beyond graduation?

The Collection of Pertinent Data

The method of data collection and the type of information to be obtained should be coordinate with the philosophy and objectives of a program, as must be the actual questions derived from the objectives. The questions asked, the means of collecting information, and the particular sample(s) of subjects must be productive of useful data.

To arrive at satisfactory answers to most of the questions listed, comprehensive studies utilizing a number of approaches to relevant data are almost imperative. The suggested or implied topics at the core of most questions warrant seeking a variety of information from numerous sources. Paradoxical as it may seem, diversification of approaches, sources and information does not imply that an excessive amount of confounding data will be collected.

Utilization of existing data sources

There seems to be a wealth of information and data resulting from previous investigations that might bear re-analysis, both for some of the questions suggested above and others relevant to the overall topic. In this fashion variety of studies conducted over the past two or three decades might profitably be reviewed for possible common (or diverse) findings, not specifically discerned or stressed in the previous reporting. Another source would be found in the vast amounts of data collected on students in many colleges which have never been subjected to any analyses. Some researchers would shudder that such data, not collected for specific reasons, and without the benefit of an acceptable research design, could be used, or they would doubt that they could be used to a profitable advantage. These reservations are to be respected, but it has been shown that data drawn from the impractical "security" of the files can be used in response to questions for which they were never originally intended.

As one example of particular interest, there would be considerable merit in validating and cross-validating the methods or means of identifying talented and creative people. We are much in need here of confirmation of what is presumably known or hypothesized, both regarding the accurate characterization and identification and the furtherance of talent. Previously obtained but existing information, for many persons presently performing (e.g., post-college) in a talented or less-talented fashion, would permit the examination of several key questions.

What are some examples of existing data sources?

a) In the area of studies generally classified as "child development" a review of and re-analysis of data from some completed and some ongoing research is suggested as possibly productive. This is certainly the case for the excellent longitudinal studies, started on a sample of infants, conducted under the auspices of the staff at the agency now titled The Institute of Human Development (University of California, Berkeley).

b) A review and re-analysis of completed and ongoing research on post-adolescent college youth would be possible through the establishment of IBM cards containing identical or similar information. A rather amazing number of studies in the past five to eight years, inclusive of high school and college youth on numerous campuses, have made use of identical or almost iden questionnaire items on topics of academic and general interest.

c) A variety of studies or sources permit the examination of possible answers to selected questions or topics through use of uncommon data. Reference is being made to questionnaire items of dissimilar wording or structure but of relevance to selected topics of particular interest. The liberalism versus conservatism issue demonstrates one topic which can be analyzed through use of quite a variety of specific attitude items employed in numerous studies.

For example, data that could be used in this more unorthodox way, at least for exploratory purposes, might be drawn from recent studies on women students at Vassar and Bennington Colleges, from quite a number of studies in coeducational colleges and from extensive investigations conducted by staffs at the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, the Center for the Study of Higher Education (Berkeley), and the Institute for the Study of Human Problems (Stanford).

To use one topical illustration of the utilization of common or uncommon information, a fairly extensive analysis of the general withdrawal problem of college women, typical of a great number of institutions, could be approached through results of varying local studies on many campuses. The data taken from application blanks or more complete questionnaires, plus the records available via transcripts, would go a long way in pursuing answers to several important questions.

d) Another possible existing data source, also within the academic context, is centered in women who continued their education in graduate programs. Again, a review and re-analysis of the results of investigations currently becoming available on students at advanced levels appear to be worthy of consideration. A few examples of pertinent data sources here would be found in studies recently reported by staff members at the National Opinion Research Center, the Center for the Study of Higher Education, and the Claremont Graduate School.

New data sources and future investigations

The chief and undoubtedly the most valuable sources of important information on talented women and their education will be projects specifically designed to obtain data which will directly facilitate the search for answers to key questions. Serious concerns about developmental and educational aspects of the implied problem(s), that is, the nurturance and furtherance of talent, necessitate consideration of all possible approaches and perspectives. The most profitable of several possibilities is centered in multiple studies of women, at several stages in the maturational sequence and at different educational levels, identifying them for varying amounts and types of talent and collecting information about them and their experiences over a period of time. Needless to say, for the most part, such studies would be no different, at least in execution, than research conducted on talented males.

Several examples of proposed new or future studies are briefly described below.

Retrospective research

The Vassar Alumni studies, conducted by Nevitt Sanford and colleagues and representing one phase of their total program, serve as a model for what might be called retrospective research. With a general pattern drawn from the Vassar studies, attention here will superficially be given to how such an approach can be utilized. This type of research is not suggested as a method of great strength but as one source of valuable information that should not be overlooked.

By identifying or selecting a sample of established, successful college-educated women in the sciences, the arts, education, civic or political activities and a sample of women restricting themselves to the home, a profitable project could be engineered. Such a sample of a selected variety, concentrating a major proportion of their time in the suggested areas, could be studied through the frequently employed questionnaires, inventories and interviews. These sources of information could or would ideally be supplemented, with the permission of the participants, by college records or transcripts. The variety of data, all of it obtained in an after-the-fact fashion except for assessments of present performance, accomplishments and attitudes, would permit some analysis of the developmental patterns leading to productive uses of talent and an examination of related background factors and educational experiences.

This approach would probably lead more to hypotheses and future research leads than it would to definitive answers.

In the past two or three years a number of women's colleges have volunteered their cooperation in the conduct of studies on alumni. With a small sample of schools involved, the subgroups of adults suggested above could be drawn from existing alumni files; thus, the academic records and transcript data could be made readily accessible. The central staff of the American Association of University Women has also offered their records and their assistance as a means to arrange for the participation of professional and non-professional women. In fact, the sampling and cooperation of adult women poses no or only a minimal problem in the execution of a major study, as has been shown by the willing participation of many women in a number of survey studies in recent years.

Studies of post-adolescents in the college setting

Possibly the most logical place to conduct future investigations is the college campus environment, especially in those institutions which manage to recruit or select large numbers of high ability, talented students. The comprehensive studies conducted on current students in colleges and universities to date, except for work completed by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, have not stressed research on the exceptional woman as such. Since the identification of the potentially talented woman can fairly easily be accomplished in the educational context and since a percentage remain immediately available for a number of years, it seems natural to initiate studies of the promotion and training of talent in settings where one would expect them to take place.

The educational agencies, where learning and change are in line with fundamental objectives, also provide the possibilities of experimentation, in that special programs can be arranged for students differentially identified, and the immediate and future effects of "combining" special students with special experiences thus become variables for analysis. As already discussed (Introduction), the social aspects of the educational environment also permit the immediate, first-hand observation and examination of facilitating, and inhibiting influences and experiences.

Some of the staff at the Center for the Study of Higher Education (Berkeley) are presently completing a six-year project of the type that would lend itself to an intensive study of the education of the gifted and talented. The objectives of this investigation of men and women in eight institutions were considerably broader than studies on a particular type of student, that is, since a large part of the objectives were concerned with numerous values, attitudes and opinions of students in a variety of educational environments as measured at different times in their college careers.

A chief purpose of this extensive project was to identify the distinguishing characteristics of students as they distributed themselves among different types of institutions and among different subcultures within single institutions. The study also aimed to extend knowledge about social and psychological forces that make for varying degrees and kinds of success in college. Much attention was given to academic achievement and to the development of serious intellectual interests and creative potentials, but the non-academic interests and outcomes of college were also major concerns of the long-range research.

A few of the major questions guiding the research will give some idea about the scope of the project: (1) What are the socio-economic and biographical factors, the relevant personality characteristics, the motivations, the educational and vocational aspirations of students in the different institutions at the time of admission? (2) What are the important changes which occur in the personalities and motivations of students during the college years in different institutions? (3) What are the major influences which play upon the students in the respective institutions and what are some of the ways in which these are exerted? (4) Are intellectual values and the development of creativity stressed and rewarded generally, or only in limited parts, of the institutions? (5) What are the relationships between the aptitude levels and personality characteristics of the students recruited or selected and the quality and record of the graduates from respective institutions?

As implied in the questions, the Center staff studied different types and groups of students in the same college environment and similar students across different environments. The expanded project had the major advantage of permitting comparative analyses of students in academic environments of quite different educational philosophies and emphases. The institutions, viewed as organizations, were studied to shed light on the determinants of the "character" of each college and on the differential impact resulting from college traditions, core values, and administrative arrangements.

Besides obtaining data on several classes in the course of two years, the students in one class were assessed several times during the four years. The data were obtained chiefly from students themselves and from records kept by the colleges. This information was gathered through questionnaires (biographical, socio-economic, attitudinal), personality inventories (traits, values, interests), autobiographies, interviews, and faculty evaluations. To supplement the comprehensive data on the one class studied over four years, a random subsample was drawn for interviewing and testing. Members of these subsamples committed themselves to cooperation and were followed whether they continued in the original college, transferred, or dropped out of college.

The research continued into a fifth and sixth year, especially to determine the placement of graduates in graduate schools or vocational positions and to determine what happened to those identified as the most creative and talented. People in the interview sample were seen again during the fith year following their matriculation in graduate programs.

Studies of young adults at the graduate and professional level

Some recent survey results, coming from research at the Berkeley Center and the National Opinion Research Center,[3] indicate that at least a percentage of the students who continue their education at advanced levels can be classified as gifted or talented. The actual percentage of the talented is probably greater than the facts would reveal since the majority of undergraduate or graduate institutions fail to make identifications in the area of creativity and talent. But, as already mentioned, many talented young women have withdrawn from college and not completed their undergraduate degree, at least in the typical period falling between the 20th and 24th year of their lives. However, the talented who finish and continue their education, whatever the number, would serve as another valuable data source for research.

Many of the talented students going beyond the B.A. program will probably be in music conservatories and schools of art, probably as many as will be continuing in graduate or professional programs. The fact that exceptional young women can be found in quite different institutions (e.g., strictly academic versus schools of art) in one sense enhances the possibilities of research. This is especially true since the considerations given to the abilities and characteristics which come under the definition of talent will vary greatly from one type of institution to another, as will the educational procedures.

---

[3] Miller, Norman. One Year After Commencement, Report No. 93, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, June 1963.

The conduct of research at this level need not be belabored here, since the mechanics of observation, the data collection and analyses would not be different from that conducted at the undergraduate level. An obvious difficulty, which can not be readily resolved, is centered in the diversity of talent and schools alluded to above. Attempts at comparative analyses, however, for samples representing different types of talent, being educated in the quite different institutions, should not be overlooked because of complicated analytical procedures. It is conceivable that studies in somé of the graduate level institutions should also focus on the environmental and program aspects which interfere with or prevent the nourishment of talented behavior. The assumed concern for the individual here, at least in most graduate programs, is more an ideal and a myth than a fact.

A Discerning Look at Data Sources

It has been stated or implied that a certain amount of discernment should be brought to the decisions regarding the data sources to be used. The emphasis was placed chiefly on the fact that the problems and education of talented women should be studied through use of several or all possible sources but that some are more likely to facilitate a more adequate approach and the collection of more appropriate data. Differences in sources were approached mostly from that standpoint of the age level or educational level. However, the concern for good sources must go beyond this, to the type of institution or the type of students within institutions, whatever the level may be. In other words, the _specific_ samples to be studied, whether at the age of preadolescents or young adults, are also of some real importance. To study any aspect of talented women there obviously must be a supply of talented or potentially talented women. This seems to demand that attention be given to operational definitions and to finding more adequate means of measuring or identifying the talented persons or degrees of talent.

As a single example of the possible difficulties involved, supposing a person plans to evaluate or do research on talented students or on the effect of honors experiences in the five institutions represented in Table 1. The particular talent in this illustration is intellectual disposition and scholarly potential. The students have been categorized into eight subgroups, all representing degrees of intellectual "readiness" or degrees of interest in behaving or performing in a scholarly fashion. These categories should not be confused with amounts of academic aptitude. Very brief definitions for the categories have been listed to give the reader an idea about the overall dimension.

Table 1

Distribution of Women Students in Five Institutions on a Dimension of "Intellectual Disposition"

Categories (Degree of Intellectual Disposition)	Institutions (Figures in Percentages)				
	Univ. X	Women's College A	Women's College B	Coed College C	Coed College D
1. Broad, intrinsic interests, with strong literary and esthetic perspectives	0.5	1	5	6	7
2. Intrinsic interests oriented toward dealing with concepts and abstractions	5	5	22	13	33
3. Intellectuality emphasizing problem solving and rational thinking	8	19	33	15	28
4. Intellectuality tempered by an achievement orientation and a disciplinary focus	17	23	24	22	18
5. Interests in academic matters and achievement, but as a means to an end	22	20	12	19	8
6. Constrained learning orientation with vocational and practical emphases	33	23	--	19	6
7. Non-intellectual with no literary or esthetic interests	9	8	2	3	--
8. Anti-intellectual, but not uninterested in tangibles and learning the "practical"	6	1	--	3	--

If one notes the proportions of women students on the various campuses falling in only the top three categories, an idea may be gained about the different student bodies attending these selective institutions. It is apparent that the percentages of women with high intellectual dispositions vary a great deal. University X and College A have 13.5 and 25 percent in the top three categories, while in Colleges B and D 60 and 68 percent of the students are in the same categories. These differences have numerous implications for the life and culture on these campuses, and they should be of even greater significance to a person who wants to do research on the students and their education and development.

Research results from several studies, where this means of categorization has been employed, have indicated that the great majority of identified creative students and most of the talented ones have a pattern of scores which place them in one of the top three categories. The obvious implication is that a serious study of the problem at hand could presumably be more readily accomplished in Colleges B and D than in University X. But, the decision is not quite that simple. Since the majority of women (85 percent) in College D, for example, who fell in the top two categories left this school before the end of the third year, a second consideration must be made. The data available at the Berkeley Center have shown this phenomenon to be true in a good many colleges, that is, a great many of the high calibre women, in the way of talent and creative potential, leave the school in which they first enrolled before completing their degree. And to conclude, this fact alone raises important questions regarding the education of talent in our society.

Conclusion

It probably goes without saying that any researcher can declare "open season" on talented women and study the problems of educating them in any setting or at any level he or she may choose. Along these lines, however, it has been suggested in this presentation that there would be merit in doing research on the problematic aspects in a variety of situations and at various levels, and more than that, it has been encouraged that the approaches to data sources and data collection also be multiple and varied. With study designs and methods ideally being derived from a specific problem and the related objectives, and with the results being contingent upon these and the samples studied, it has also been pointed out that some sources and approaches appear to be much more appropriate for furnishing essential data and provide quicker means to obtaining meaningful answers and understanding.

PLENARY SESSION

"Survey of the College Scene: Women in Honors Programs"

John S. Eells, Jr., Honors Council, Winthrop College

Kathleen O. Elliott, Dean, Radcliffe College

Sister Fides, Academic Dean, The College of St. Catherine

Otto G. Graf, Director of Honors, University of Michigan

Lucian C. Marquis, Director, Honors College, University of Oregon

Walter D. Weir, Director of Honors, University of Colorado

WINTHROP COLLEGE

John S. Eells

If anybody is foolhardy this morning I am, because I am attempting to discuss honors at a southern college for women, and I am neither a southerner nor a woman. I do not know just what the result will be, but I hope I can give you some views. I emphasize the fact that they are my personal views, and not necessarily those of the management.

I should say a word or two about the college from which I come. Winthrop is a state-supported college for women in South Carolina. It is basically a liberal arts college with the usual pre-professional opportunities such as education, music, business, physical education, home economics, and so forth. The current enrollment is about 2,240; and of these 2,240 students about 125 (or 5.5%) are currently in our honors program.

I would like to say a word about the Winthrop girls. By that I suppose I mean a certain regional type; and I imagine that my remarks, more than those of my colleagues, will be somewhat regionally significant. I think you ought to discount their validity, if they have any validity at all, for other parts of the country. The Winthrop girl is one who enjoys very much being a woman. I do not mean that girls do not do so in other parts of the country, but she noticeably does; and so does her mother, who is fortyish; and her grandmother who is sixtyish; and her great-grandmother who is eightyish; I suppose there are some great-great-grandmothers lurking around somewhere. I have not found them yet, but I don't for a minute doubt that they exist, and that they too very much enjoy being women. The typical Winthrop girl comes from a small town. Rock Hill, the city in which the college is located, has a population of about 30,000. Most of the girls coming there have never been to such a big place before. They are quite bewildered by its size. These girls are protected, they are docile, they are very strongly oriented toward home and church, and they like men as instructors better than women. I started out as a father image, and now that I am a grandfather image things seem to be even better.

They are sweet and very encouraging. Let me tell you something that happened the first semester I taught at Winthrop. This was before our honors program existed. For some reason I happened to mention (I cannot imagine why, because it is not one of my pet topics), the law of the Medes and the Persians. A perfectly adorable little creature in the back row raised her hand and said in a charming drawl, "Ah though you'd be interested to know that mah mother was a Meade: from Charleston." She offered this comment perfectly seriously, without any intent at all to disconcert or to deflate me. She was such a kittenish little thing that I thought she looked more as if her daddy had been a Persian.

These girls want the answers. This is one of their troubles. Most of them are not convinced, and I do not know when they will be convinced, that intellectual uncertainty is respecable. But since they do want all the answers, one of our great problems in honors is to satisfy them with the right questions, or what we hope are the right questions, with no emphasis on answers. I had a sad experience in an interdisciplinary seminar which I conducted. When it was over, one of the best of the 10 or 12 girls in the seminar came to me and said, "Well, when are we going to get the answers?" I said, "You're not going to get any." "Well," she said, "then I can get a preacher who'll come up and give them to us." I said, "Over my dead body." So I differed from her point of view, and that was that.

Honors at Winthrop is four years old; experimental, flexible, still feeling its way. We continue to learn about it. In general honors, our program consists, at present, of a colloquium for second semester freshmen, and of carefully selected, carefully staffed, very small, high-powered sections of general education courses for freshmen and sophomores. Then, for juniors and seniors, we offer interdisciplinary seminars and individual directed study. In addition, we have a rather slowly burgeoning, program of departmental honors, in which juniors and seniors may concentrate in their major fields. Departmental honors are currently operative in English, chemistry, biology, and history. Both general and departmental honors are carefully scrutinized by the Honors Council, a faculty group appointed by the president and working under the supervision of the Dean of the College.

Our great problem, as I see it, is two fold. The first of these is attrition, with which I would also consider the problem of reluctance to accept our invitations to enter the program. I have a very modest dose of statistics here which I was not going to inflict on you until I saw Mr. Cameron come in, and then I thoughthe might feel cheated if I did not do so, so here goes. These figures have to do with the class of 1964, graduating in a day or two. The total number of entering freshmen for the entire college in 1960 was 661. But here is a disturbing fact. Of these, 296, or 45%, dropped out before graduation and 7% graduated early by means of summer school or other acceleration; so that of the 661 students who entered four years ago, only 320, or 48%, will graduate this month. Now let's look at the honors group. In 1960, not knowing any better, we asked the 100 best-qualified freshmen to enter the honors program. This was our first year of operation. Of the hundred we invited, 87 accepted, 13% of the 661 entering freshmen. Of these 87 honors freshmen who entered four years ago, 26 dropped out before graduation, another 26 graduated early (which took a big bite out of our number) and 35 will graduate this month. Now let's compare some figures. In the class of 1964 as a whole, 45% dropped out before graduation, while only 29% of our honors frehmmen did; 7% graduated early, whereas 29% of our honors freshmen did that. So maybe things aren't so bad after all.

Now what is the reason for all this attrition? Well one, of course, is anti-intellectualism on the campus. I hope that Winthrop is not peculiar in this, but I do feel rather strongly that we should devise honorable and ethical means of protecting our talented women from untalented women. This is my main thesis. I think the great threat to the talented woman is the untalented woman. The southern girl can take care of herself when it comes to men, but I am not sure she can handle a great mass of untalented women. First let us look at the situation in college. I think we ought to protect our talented girls from those earnest Amazons in physical education who do not like lack of interest in the theory of volley ball or the principles of elementary tumbling, or something like that. I also think we ought to protect them from so-called sophomore advisors, designated to counsel them about social or personal matters, not about academics, but who will come up to them and say, "Y'all don't take that course, heah?" And they don't. Maybe we ought to look out for late bloomers, for whom I have a great sympathy. Because of the wonderful opportunities we could give them, we ought, for their sakes, to be as flexible as we can when it comes to academic bookkeeping. Many admirable students flunk out of college just because they are plain bored. They are taking something which is dull or repetitious or otherwise stultifying and they will not make an effort and they flunk - not because they should, but because they do.

I think it is a good thing that most of these girls of whom I am talking come from small towns. They want to go home and marry the boy next door. They are deeply devoted to these towns. To wrench them away and send them to graduate school would in some cases be emotionally drastic. Now do not misunderstand me. I do not think that none of our girls should go to graduate school. I do not mean that at all. Many of them have gone, and have made very brilliant records. In the last few years we have had three M.D.'s who married doctors, are raising families, and are practicing. How they do it, I do not know. We have had some very distinguished records in graduate school.

All I am saying is that I think that it would be a wonderful thing if this conference could somehow, at least for the girls in this particular region, devise some means of using the fine talents of those who for a great many reasons do not want to go to graduate school. I would like to see some of our honors girls go back to their hometowns and spread infinite riches in a little room. The small town may be limited in opportunity, but in it enthusiasm goes a long way. Lynn White said long ago that when you educate a woman you educate an entire family. I think if you educate a talented woman you run the risk, at least, of educating an entire community. I would like to see some of these girls go back to their home towns and get into school administration. I would like to see them be principals. I would like to see them be superintendents. I'd like to see them (and this is a dream), get into the state legislature, because there they would have a marvelous opportunity to use their fine talents broadly and wisely.

Let me close my remarks, my time now being up, with a reiteration of this theory of mine - that the greatest threat to our best students is untalented women, whose deadening pressure will force the talented girl into the stultifying morass of women's clubs, bridge parties, church socials and all that sort of thing. The talented woman should be protected from this pressure. I think also that we should help her, (and this is the job of the sociologists and psychologists) to find just the right kind of husband. The talented boy may not always be the answer, for talented people sometimes tear each other apart. For the kind of girl I am talking about, a good, steady, appreciative boy who runs a gas station might be better. I do not know. I only teach English. I think, however, that our brilliant girl, if she does not go to graduate school, should probably return to her hometown. That is where her heart is and that is where she could be, if my dream became true, like an air conditioner - giving life and vigor and stimulus to an otherwise stale and static room.

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE

Kathleen O. Elliott

I have consented reluctantly to speak today for I fear that my actual contribution to this panel can be of little value. Our honors program is of long duration, there have been no special efforts made to involve young women in it and such research studies as we have made on our graduates have not produced the answers to the questions those responsible for this conference have posed and hope will be answered.

My reluctance is in no way owing to lack of concern, for I have followed with interest the growth of honors programs reported in The Superior Student, and like all of you, approve the encouragement of "the pursuit of excellence." My concern with the gifted student began many years ago, when as a director of admissions I was acutely aware that little was being done at the secondary school level. And my interest has continued to the present, and is related to my teaching and to the counselling of students.

But, and I now footnote my reluctance, our program (which is exactly Harvard's) is complex and pervasive and therefore difficult to present with clarity. I should seriously doubt that a single person at Harvard or Radcliffe could tell you, correctly and in detail, what is involved in each of the 30-odd departments. There is no single pattern. The complexity is not under question. This is one of its aspects which has general approval.

As for the pervasiveness, that is, the large numbers in the program this has been questioned both in and outside the college. It is not an exaggeration to state that at some time or other in their college careers most of our students consider the possibility of entering the honors program, and when I say most, I refer to all but perhaps 5 to 10 percent. At home and abroad there have been suggestions that the program should be restricted to give the honors program and the honors degree real meaning, on the theory, I assume, that "in the land where everybody is somebody, nobody is anybody." There have been no moves in that direction. On the contrary, the numbers increase.

An attempt to explain what is involved in the program may be in order. I have mentioned complexity, and for oral presentation I am obliged to oversimplify. (I deliberately avoid any statement of the qualifications for entering the honors program since they vary from department to department, generally involving both a good record and a good performance in sophomore tutorial which is obligatory in all but a few departments.) First, more courses in the major field or related fields are usually required. Secondly, there is individual tutorial in the junior and senior years, and finally, a thesis in the senior year. A continuing record of good quality is understood.

Now, the reason for the numbers. To make this meaningful, I should give you some notion of scope. Over half the graduating class of 1963 took honors degrees in major fields, and if we add those with the cum laude degree in general studies, a degree not involving the tutorial program and thesis, we get a figure of 83 percent. Our freshmen have just declared their choices of major fields and of 300, 260 have declared themselves honors candidates, about ten have not, the remainder have an open mind.

To a very great extent the numbers are related to the quality of the students. They are good. They sense quickly that they are in what many of their faculty regard as an honors college, though they might not put it just that way. They have been among the best students in their high schools. They have been more and more exposed to special programs, for example, the new mathematics and physics courses, the Advanced Placement courses, etc. And they continue to want the best, the special program that exists for the best. The influence of the new secondary programs is I believe marked, and I suspect it is primarily to them that we can attribute the sharp rise in the numbers of our students taking honors degrees in the past five years.

Moreover, it is probable that we have a self-selected student body, that our applicants are by and large young women who are competitive, who have serious intellectual interests, and intend to develop them. The other day I inquired of a freshman why she had declared herself an honors candidate and she said, "Well, it's expected." And when I asked her by whom, she paused and looked at me quizzically for she suddenly realized for the first time that she had heard no official pronouncements or exhortations on the subject, and replied that she guessed it was her friends who expected it and thereby denied her own expectations.

Sophomore tutorial, group tutorial in the major field, is, as I have said, obligatory except in a few departments. Here very often, if not in a freshman seminar, begins the desire not just to be an excellent student or to be a part of the program for the best, but here begin true scholarly interests. The appetite is whetted for more.

The desire for individual tutorial instruction (which is given to juniors and seniors in honors), apart from the recognized value of the one to one teaching realtionship, may be keen in a university setting where the common mode of teaching is the lecture. And as an aside, even as the university may be to some extent responsible for the numbers in the program so it makes it possible by providing the staff.

Some young women seek the opportunity to work in depth, that is, to have more courses in their special field. For others the possibility of independent research involved in the thesis is appealing. This possibility also exists for juniors and seniors under the rubric of independent study, which may be taken by students with honors records, not necessarily members of the honors program. But independent study is unstructured, whereas the work for the thesis is more supervised and controlled and is under critical judgment.

I suspect, and this is my last comment on the reasons for our numbers, many students want honors degrees, though our percentage going on to further study directly from college is not especially high, about 40 to 45 percent, yet ultimately much higher. I have no figure here, but my colleagues conservatively estimate at least 70 percent, after a break for marriage or work or travel. Those who have their eye on graduate and professional schools feel that the honors degree has significance in gaining admission and fellowships. Actually, for most, their degree of honors is not determined when decisions are made, but not to have been a part of an honors program may make their departments less enthusiastic or actually bring into question with a graduate school of arts and sciences their commitment to a major discipline.

Much of my observation is no more than incidental intelligence of a particular kind. If I had a word or two of comment that might be helpful to those who are in the process of beginning honors programs or expanding them--(and these are very personal)-- I should suggest that such programs flourish best in an academic environment where the degree requirements are not too restrictive, where the student may feel that she may make her special commitment without being hemmed in, or cut off from other areas of knowledge she would like to explore. Moreover, I suggest that "the open society" appears to be in order, including the opportunity to begin an honors program reasonably early in the college career. There is value in being able to move both in and out of the program. I cannot tell you that this can be done with the greatest of ease, but with negotiation and careful planning it can usually be managed.

Those of you who have counselled gifted young women, who have heard them out as they wrestle with their difficult decision making, know that they need time. And neither the too early commitment if binding, nor the impossibility of a later one is, I believe, correct. Indeed, identification--to use the word which frequently occurs in your literature--of the truly talented, even among those who are potentially and entirely of honors calibre, is not always easy. Allowance must be made for the occurrence of that moment of excitement and awakening at different levels. There is not unanimity of view on this point, for this flexibility is costly in time and personnel, but, for my own part, I am convinced of its value.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. CATHERINE

Sister Fides

I have been asked to speak on problems connected with the honors program at the College of St. Catherine, a college for women in St. Paul, Minnesota. The college is mid-western in composition as well as location, since most of the students come from Minnesota or adjacent states, although 29 states and 19 foreign countries are represented. It is moderate in size, with an enrollment of about 1400 students, of whom 500 are in residence on campus. They come, for the most part, from homes of moderate means.

Our "honors program" is three-fold: 1) honors reading 2) honors forum 3) departmental honors and honors courses. With this third category I also include independent study, although this is not necessarily restricted to honors students. We do not have an "honors college" nor do we have special honors sections of general courses.

According to our most recent general catalog, the honors reading program is a three-year program of guided readings, discussion, and independent study projects or papers. A student may participate from two to six semesters. The class is a discussion period, with two instructors participating, usually as discussion leaders.

The program grew out of a suggestion and an investigation made by the Educational Policies Committee of the faculty several years ago, and met with a stony reception from the faculty in general. It was nevertheless tried as an experiment and after one year of successful performance its direction was turned over to a special faculty committee called the Honors Council, whose function was supposed to be to coordinate all the honors courses in existence on campus.

Honors reading was intended to be an unconventional course giving students freedom to argue and discuss problems without the necessity of acquiring a certain fund of knowledge or a certain skill or technique. It was planned as a three-year sequence: the first year, on the themes of freedom and responsibility and the individual and society, dealt with problems of social and political responsibility; the second year, man and his world, was concerned with physical science and psychology; the third year's discussions centered around the problems of the artist in the world.

The original plan was to have twelve instructors involved, two for each semester, in order to expose students to different minds and methods of thought and varied ways of stimulating discussion. The first group had four teachers in the first year, two women the first semester, two men the second. Here we encountered the first problem - faculty. In theory, the variety of instructors was good; in practice it proved difficult to find enough faculty members interested in participating in such an unstructured and unspecialized course and able to stimulate discussion and critical thinking leaving questions unanswered and problems unsolved.

There was no great problem about reading material. Readings for the course were selected by the instructors themselves, working with an outline suggested by the Honors Council, but not bound to follow it. The choices ranged from classics to recent issues of Daedalus. With few exceptions, the students have found these significant, even momentous in some way.

This is, of course, a subjective judgment, but it is the only way we have of evaluating the worth of the course. It was given for the first time five years ago and one class has been graduated who have had the three-year sequence. Recently we sent a questionnaire to all present and former students in any of the courses. All who responded said that the course had taught them to think and that they considered it valuable.

We ourselves also consider it successful and useful, but we are aware that there are other problems besides faculty. We have not yet found a satisfactory method of recruiting incoming freshmen for the first-year class. We send a letter of invitation, describing the course, to about 75 incoming students who seem to be the best candidates. About 35 or 40 of those who indicate interest actually register for the class, and about 20 of these really should. Some do not like discussion and rarely contribute; some are practiced in the filibuster. Some never cease expecting a class to consist of information to be memorized and returned in the same condition as received. Although they performed well in high school they are not really interested in intellectual stimulation but want their ideas left undisturbed. Those who do want to think, however, continue in the course and continue to be leading students in their major departments as well as in honors reading.

Perhaps because of somewhat unsatisfactory selection in the first year, we have not been conspicuously successful in retaining enrollment for the second and the third year of the course. The reason for the dropout, however, is not always lack of interest but often lack of time. The demands of major departments sometimes crowd out all else. Those who answered our questionnaire said that if given the choice again they would take honors reading.

What means we will use to improve our selection of candidates will be decided during the summer. So also will the future of the second facet of our program, honors forum. This is a discussion group, not a class, meeting about twice a month at a time when most students are free. Top-ranking freshmen and sophomores, whether or not they are in honors reading, are invited to participate. This group has officers who prepare a short bibliography on some topic of current or enduring interest and lead small groups in discussion. There is no credit, no class work, and no compulsion. Faculty advisers and others who have attended have said that it is effective when there is a dynamic and well-organized student in charge. The two advisers this year agree that it has served no useful purpose and should be abandoned. We have not made an attempt to evaluate it objectively, but unless we find some enthusiastic faculty member who wishes to advise the group, we shall not continue it.

Our third aspect, departmental honors, aims to provide the opportunity for intensive study and original work in the student's major field of interest. The type of project, of course, varies with departments, but the usual procedure is this: The student, with the approval of the chairman of the department, chooses a topic before the end of the junior year and continues to work on it during the summer and the fall semester of the senior year. The completed paper, report of experimental data and conclusions, or art project is submitted during the final semester and is judged by three persons, two from the college faculty and one from some other college in the area. Some excellent papers have been submitted and some original and truly creative work has been done in science and the arts. Occasionally students have submitted projects which could not be approved and papers judged unworthy but these have been few. Almost the only problem has been that of adhering to some sort of standard practice in all departments.

In addition to these individual research projects some departments have special honors courses for a few very advanced and very gifted students who undertake work at a level beyond their other courses. We have also encouraged able students to follow courses independently - to work privately and at their own pace rather than with a class. They and we have been pleased with the results.

All these methods should interest our best students in graduate school but not as many graduating seniors as we would like enter graduate school immediately. One of the reasons for this is financial; more than three-fourths of our students need financial aid in order to complete their undergraduate education and they are not willing to assume an additional debt or to defer payment of the debt they have already assumed. Not all are able to obtain fellowships or assistantships and even those willing to live on an assistant's stipend are pressured by parents into fields which will give them immediate security, such as high school teaching.

Many feel a need for independence. One of our 1963 graduates, a Woodrow Wilson Fellow now working on a master's degree in comparative literature, wrote recently: "I would like to go on for my doctorate, but I must teach for a while in order to prove to my family that I can be successful at something besides studying."

Others think that they should have teaching or other experience before entering graduate school, in order, they say, to "bring more to graduate study." In a survey made last summer by our "adviser for graduate study," the fact came to light that many had enrolled in graduate school after three, four, or five years in teaching or some other profession.

The appointment of this adviser, however, has done much to keep graduate school in the plans of students. More seniors have been applying for assistantships and fellowships and more have been successful in obtaining them. They are aware, because they have been told this frequently, that standards for admission as well as for financial aid are higher for women than for men. And they are also well aware that jobs, salaries, and advancement policies are often different for women than for men. Some are reluctant to face the competition and choose less competitive professions like nursing or secondary school teaching. By persuasion, of parents as well as students, we have, however, been able to interest a few in college teaching.

Although it is too early to judge, it seems to us that the University of Chicago three-year MA program in which we participate, along with 36 other colleges, has helped increase interest in college teaching and in graduate school. Under a grant from the Ford Foundation, the University has set up 50 graduate fellowships in the humanities in order to prepare college teachers. The candidates are selected by the participating colleges at the end of the sophomore year, and their courses of study are carefully planned with the University program in mind. On our campus, one special course has been set up for these students, a class in the analysis of texts, in which other honors students may also participate.

Most of our students who go into graduate programs are in the humanities. English and foreign languages have been popular fields, but there have been others in history, sociology, psychology, biology, chemistry, mathematics, art, nursing. A very small number have gone to medical school and now have successful practices. A small number have also gone into law, most of these after several years of marriage and several children.

Apart from these few in medicine and law, scarcely any of our top-ranking graduates have entered professions other than those commonly followed by women: teaching, nursing, social work, librarianship, occupational therapy. A few chemistry or biology majors are in research, and some mathematics majors are computer analysts.

I share the opinion of Miss Helen Schlemm, Dean of Women at Purdue, that girls' aspirations are more modest than their abilities and that one explanation is that no one else has very high expectations for them. "We communicate to girls in many ways," she says, "our lack of positive expectations for them....One of the most obvious ways is that we don't show them many models of women who are loved, honored, respected, and rewarded for their intellectual achievements on our campuses." ("How is the Education of Women Different from the Education of Men?" paper presented at the 19th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, April 21, 1964.)

Our problem in counselling is to encourage students to use their abilities in tried or untried fields and to convince them that women can be successful in them. This, presumably, was satisfactorily proved long ago, but some of our students do not yet know this.

Our students have had a long record of unusual success in obtaining Fulbright fellowships and foreign government grants. Once one group was successful in application others were encouraged to try. Recently this has been true of other fellowships. It could likewise be true of aspirations to be research physicists, or mathematicians, or college presidents.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Otto G. Graf

My statement is not going to offend on the side of excessive factuality - a characteristic of reports and surveys, as we were reminded, which Barzun deplores so understandably, nor will it provide the results of extensive planning, thinking or theorizing on the subject of this conference. Statistics, to be sure, appear in the University's Annual Reports, and we can learn quite readily how graduating seniors are distributed by colleges, schools, fields of concentration, and gender. But dropout data is not readily available. Consequently, follow-up studies have not been assayed, and though there is considerable awareness that the problem confronting us requires research, very little has been done as yet with the exception of a short study of our honors seniors who were awarded fellowships or the citation, "honorable mention" in the Woodrow Wilson competition of 1963. This study, although very modest in scope, furnished some leads.

My report to you will describe the honors program of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts of the University of Michigan, the bases for selecting students to participate in it, the composition of its enrollment, and some of the problems, as we have observed them, which beset the coed in her quest for intellectual and academic fulfillment.

I should begin by stating that the bases for admission to the honors program are not adjusted to accommodate the distaff side. Identification of talent, assessment of ability and promise, high achievement in preparatory schooling, and degree of intellectual quality - the same standards for admission are applied to women and men alike. In justification of our recognizing no differences in applying them, I must point out that the great majority of our students received their preparatory training in public high schools, were in college preparatory curricula, and were identified in high school honors programs, advanced placement courses, enriched programs, accelerated course work or other dispensations available to the ambitious, academically oriented high school student. On the basis of all information available to us - high school transcripts, SAT scores, CEEB achievement scores, advanced placement examination results, the National Merit selection scores, the high school principal's recommendation, and a personal interview - about 15% of an incoming freshman class is admitted to honors.

The faculty of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts has created an honors curriculum starting with the freshman year and continuing through the senior year. The curriculum parallels the conventional course offerings in all but two departments of the College. Honors opportunities are in the form of honors introductory courses, interdisciplinary seminars, and junior and senior honors seminars and tutorials in the several fields of concentration. The student in honors must elect a minimum of two honors courses each semester. He may elect more than two after he has given a demonstration of his capacity. The enrollment in our honors courses on all levels is kept small, the pedagogical method is largely dialogue, extensive interaction between students and teacher is assured, and the instructional staff consists of the most dedicated teacher-scholars on the faculty. One other opportunity, for particularly promising science students is the Unified Science sequence, consisting of four semesters of mathematics, two of physics, and two of physical chemistry. The Unified Science program, a very sophisticated and rigorous orientation, in which the three component disciplines are thoroughly integrated, constitutes a foundation for concentration mainly in honors mathematics, or physics, chemistry, or astronomy. To it are invited only students of outstanding mathematical achievement and scientific promise.

The students currently enrolled in honors are distributed by class and by sex as follows:

class	men	attrition	women	attrition
1967	204	12	155	15
1966	172	18	137	23
1965	127	50	97	61
1964	117	28	88	37

Attrition here means loss to the honors program, but not to the College. Students who fail to maintain a "B" record are transferred out of honors. The freshman and sophomore loss to honors is about 10% with women representing 58% of the total attrition. The rate of attrition for academic failure of first year students in the College is about 9% - about 185 in a class of 2200 freshmen. This has been the approximate rate for the past three years.

About one-third of the academic failures are women. By contrast, then, the rate of women transfers out of honors during the first two years has been quite consistently one-third greater than that of men, but actual dropout in the college due to academic failure is one-third that of men.

Our current freshman honors group of 359 remaining with us from an original total of 386 represents those selected after a study of 512 records of qualified applicants for admission to the college. Of the 512 more than half were women - our records show 273. 170 of them accepted the invitation to participate in honors. Our experience in interviews shows that despite strong records, marked abilities, the coed is quite sensitive to being identified as an honors student - at least, she is more sensitive to the identification than the male student. Parents, also, are wont to share her misgivings and are not always willing to have their daughters enter an academic program requiring dedication to academics at the expense of extra-curricular social opportunities. Parents of daughters like to have their offspring enter an academic program with a discernible professional end - physical therapy, medical technician, primary and secondary school certification. Sororities create pressures as well, and quite commonly have done their bit of guidance and advising before the student gets to us. Some parents of daughters, frequently, and sororities quite generally are apparently convinced that continuation of academic achievement and excellence is not "le moyen de parvenir" and still get the most out of college. Letters of inquiry from parents of students-to-be ask most frequently about special opportunities for their sons, but rarely does a letter of inquiry concern acceptance of a daughter.

The greatest attrition in the course of the freshman year is among women in Unified Science. Eighty-five freshmen were admitted last September and upon completion of the first year, 68 are still in the program, qualifying to complete the second and final year. Of the 17 who dropped, 11 were women of the original 15 who entered it. The science advisers on my staff have kept close check on this particular community. None of the women has dropped out because of academic failure. Most of them admitted some discomfiture because their classes were largely made up of men - at least, they claimed that classes dominated by men, taught exclusively by men were responsible for loss of confidence, subversion of interest and motivation. But some of the girls who experienced a marked shift of interest were obviously victims of a post-sputnik hysteria and were steered into the sciences by an over zealous high school teacher who may have been impressed by their lively interest in science and a marked competence in mathematics and easily convinced them that science was their cup to tea. Competence and industry enabled them to fulfill the standard for retention in our science program but motivation diminished in the course of the year as other interests asserted themselves. The shift of interest is largely to the social sciences, psychology mainly, with English a close second.

A number of factors accounts for the drop in numbers from the sophomore to the junior year. Upon completion of the fourth semester the student must apply for honors candidacy in his department of concentration. Standards for selection are high and the junior and senior honors seminars are very demanding, so demanding that in the sciences a student cannot support much of an extracurricular interest; in the social sciences and the humanities, the investment of time required of the student precludes any preemptive outside activity. Only the most dedicated coeds are likely to venture into the honors concentration programs. At this point both men and women have a fairly clear notion of their objectives, and with the exception of those who have medicine, law, or dentistry in mind (here the number of women is very small) most of our present juniors and graduating seniors are intending to begin graduate studies in preparation for advanced degrees. 92% of our present senior honors class is going on to higher education, most of them with supporting scholarships or fellowships. Of the 88 women seniors, 70 are entering graduate school this fall; 10 plan to do so after a job in the world; 8 indicate they are tired of school; in fact, one stated she was going to be a beatnik housewife and compete in motorcycle racing to get school out of her system. She had just had her comprehensives in English and perhaps her vehemence and desperation are exaggerated but understandable. It is apparent to us, on the basis of an annual inquiry into student plans, that 90% or more of the graduating honors seniors are not only going on to graduate study but are planning to prepare themselves for college teaching. This is not a declared objective of our honors program but students are attracted to college teaching as a career through the close association they have had with their teachers and tutors, through the close insights they have been enabled to gain into the academic existence, and through the opportunities they have had to associate with graduate students and faculty as junior colleagues.

The persistence of our women students who are entering advanced degree programs and who aspire to academic careers represents a triumph of the spirit and the number which has survived the pressures of a masculine dominated education setting out to seek a career in the masculine dominated profession of college teaching is an impressive one. One wonders how far they will get, once they question the practicality of their aspirations.

Our major problem at Michigan is not so much a question of keeping the talented woman in school or keeping her in an honors program. Our problem, by no means confined to one academic community, is to convince the talented woman that she can achieve self-fulfillment through academic excellence, that this self-fulfillment will find acceptance and will lead to a career not to the detriment or stifling of her domestic role.

This has been the subject of a number of discussions amongst our staff and students. We do not think that curricular adjustments preparing the woman for the multiple role she must assume are particularly well advised. There can't be two kinds of mathematics, or English, or foreign language, one for the male, one for the female. Training in domestic skills lies in the domain of the high school and the home. Nor do we deem it necessary to plan the inclusion of courses for women to remind them of the multiple role awaiting them. All of the forces of American society do this and society is apparently doing too good a job of it.

The study referred to earlier[1], performed in the spring of 1963 on the Woodrow Wilson finalists, of which there were 24, and the honorable mention runners-up, 19 in number, had two purposes: 1. to obtain a body of information about this select group of students (they were all in honors) and 2. to determine the process by which college teaching is selected as a career, and the place in that process of self-concept, self-esteem, perception of the teaching faculty and the influence of faculty on the decision.

In a group of students who appear to be academically homogeneous, there were two major divisions: Woodrow Wilson finalists and those receiving the citation, "honorable mention," and male and female. The first division is of no pertinence here, but in relating self-concept to the choice of career, some differences were found which are based on sex. The boys are inclined to seek identification through vocation, while for girls identification is quite directly associated with the personal and social aspects of the teaching profession. Boys in the group judged both themselves and their teachers in terms of the work performed, while girls were primarily concerned with the quality of relationships and measured both themselves and their college teachers in those terms. The planning for the future on the girls' part is characterized by lack of realism and realistic awarenesses. This is evident in that they see themselves falling somewhat short of professional aspirations without diminution of self-esteem. Self-esteem among the girls studied is not related to their chosen profession.

---

[1] Austin, C. Grey, The Relation of Self-concept to Perception of College Teaching, Honors Council and Center for the Study of Higher Education (unpublished), 1963.

The conclusions which can be drawn from this study show that while male and female students select the same profession and bring to it equal academic achievement, one cannot expect females to move toward that profession with any singleness of purpose - a singleness which characterizes male planning. Most girls in the group, it is indicated, will find a major source of personal identification elsewhere.

The questions most pertinent to the conduct of an honors program and to the subject of this conference which emerged from the study are:

1. Are the non-academic factors in academic success sufficiently considered in counseling the academically select students? The study, supported by our experience, shows that attributes of personality, not always reflected in mediocre performance, may inhibit the realization of full potential. Are there methods of counseling, preventive and remedial, which might supplement our present services to the advantage of this select group?

2. The woman in an honors program is in all likelihood preparing herself for advanced degrees and most commonly, college teaching. Does she need special attention if she is to find a workable solution to the career-marriage conflict?

3. Might not the academic community provide some visible proof to the academically oriented coed that women can combine professional commitment and a domestic role?

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Lucian C. Marquis

This brief description of the Honors College at the University of Oregon is based, first of all, upon the reporter's impressions and second upon a study that has been carried out since the inception of the College by Robert Ellis, a sociologist.

The Honors College at the University of Oregon is a new venture. It began in 1960, and this year will be graduating its first class. The purpose of the Honors College is to create a college within the university--awarding a separate degree of B.A. Honors College which is not identical with "Cum Laude" or the other honors degrees that are usually given. The emphasis is placed upon a separate kind of experience for student and teacher, downgrading to some extent grade point averages and emphasizing the special character of the curriculum and of the community of scholars. We try to create an identity, for example, with an Honors College Center where students meet all day and part of the night and where a small paper-back library allows the student to browse. Within this Center we carry on discussions somewhat along the line of the forum described by the previous speaker. On the other hand, in contrast to what Mr. Graf described, the students at Oregon are very reluctant to get themselves involved in separate living arrangements. We launched a couple of trial balloons on Honors living quarters; the students rejected these very strongly.

The purpose then of the Honors College is to create a community of people who, prior to the formation of the College, had been passing each other like ships in the night. We sought to build within the University a community of able students whose academic development would be encouraged in a variety of ways.

We recruit students to the Honors College through a newsletter which we send out to approximately 3,000 high school teachers and counselors, through various high school honors societies which come on campus for conferences, by sending out letters to National Merit Scholarship semi-finalists, and so on. We found in our study that the parents of Honors College students--and this contrasts somewhat with the NORC studies that were distributed to conferees--were most influential in their decision to go to college. However, the high school counselors were most influential in the students' decision to come to the Honors College. In particular was this true for women.

Our admissions committee consists of three, one of whom is a woman: Leona Tyler, a psychologist. We find that there is probably some bias against women built into our admission procedures since we do not look at the high school grades. Generally women do much better on that score than men. On the other hand, this bias may be balanced out by the fact that women score higher than men on the verbal aptitude test.

Our criteria for admission are an autobiographical statement which the student writes, letters of recommendation from his teachers, and the college entrance board scores. In reading over the autobiographical statements (and I am in the process of doing this right now) I find that men students tend to be more interesting in their autobiographical sketch. There is a kind of ticky-tacky quality about many of the women students. Perhaps this is just my male prejudice.

We asked the students whom we admitted what were their reasons for coming to college and we divided the reasons into two categories--intellectual kinds of reasons and instrumental kinds of reasons (instrumental kinds of reasons being coming to college to prepare for a career, for marriage, rather than becoming involved with ideas), and we found an interesting distinction--(again please keep in mind that many of these conclusions are highly tentative because we have only interviewed students over the past two or three years). Amongst the men, 48% said that they came to college for intellectual reasons and 46% for instrumental reasons. Amongst the women 64% said they came for intellectual reasons and only 22% for instrumental reasons. In a matched sample of men (not in the Honors College) the instrumental reasons for coming to college were predominant. Eight-one percent of the matched sample in contrast to the 46% of the Honors College students said they came for instrumental reasons--only 10% came for intellectual reasons.

The distribution of men and women in the Honors College is approximately even. In 1963-64, 213 men and 212 women were enrolled. Total Honors College enrollment represents about 5% of the undergraduate student body. It may also be of interest that these 5% receive 21% of the scholarships in the University.

The curricular pattern in the Honors College is as follows: A core program consisting of six areas (one-year sequences) culminating in comprehensive examinations which are given both at the end of the spring term and at the beginning of the fall term. Students may prepare for the examination by independent study. Core courses are given in history, literature, social science or economics, philosophy, mathematics (a terminal course or an advanced course) and the sciences (a choice among biology, chemistry, physics, physical science survey). The comprehensive examination rather than the grades per se, is the mark of whether the student will continue in the Honors College. After a student has successfully completed the comprehensive examinations in the six core areas he enters a departmental program which is also closely coordinated with the College. Just as at Radcliffe, these programs vary greatly from department to department, but most of them, except in mathematics and in physics, culminate in a thesis.

In addition to this, upper division students must also enroll in at least two colloquia. The colloquium is a kind of seminar cum bull session--no grade given. Colloquia are focused on a particular topic, e.g., "Mass Society and Mass Culture," "The Origin and Nature of Life." They involve a number of instructors who meet at the same hour in relatively small sections. For example, this year (and here women students were particularly important in getting this colloquium started by clamoring for it) we offered a colloquium--one term dealing with art of the Baroque, one term dealing with early 20th Century art, and one term dealing with avant-garde art. Approximately 15 students meet with an instructor--students who are not in that particular field--thus, if a student is in the humanities we try to place him in a colloquium in the sciences. Of course we could not do this in the art colloquium but if a student is musically inclined we tried to place him with an instructor in art or in the theater or one in writing. The colloquium on avant-garde art had a final session in which the best products were read to the students from all sections. One boy had written a play--an avant-garde play very derivative of course with some Pirandello, some Ionesco--but it was still fascinating. In connection with the colloquium we also bring in outside speakers, people of some distinction, who speak to a University-wide audience and also meet for discussion with the colloquium group. In connection with the colloquium on Baroque art Eva Heinitz (viola da gamba) talked about her instrument before the colloquium and also gave a University-wide performance.

After having fulfilled his core course requirements, which also include work in English composition and foreign languages, the student launches on his departmental major. Honors College students, both men and women, major in all of the departments and also in most of the professional schools, though in the School of Law we have had very few women so far. This year, more women than men are graduating from the Honors College--19 women out of 33 graduating students.

When we examined the questions of satisfaction with the program and "dropouts" we found that there is no significant difference between men and women as far as their perception of intellectual stimulation is concerned. For both men and women intellectual satisfaction is very high. When students were asked whether they would enter the Honors College again, approximately 64% said that they would. Again there was no difference in outlook between men and women that we could find. When students were asked whether they had ever seriously considered dropping out of the Honors College, approximately 25% said yes they had considered it.

What is the dropout pattern? In the freshman class of 1961 7% of the men and 2% of the women dropped out for academic reasons. Four percent of the men and 5% of the women withdrew from the Honors College on their own volition, and 17% of the men and 20% of the women withdrew from the University of Oregon. As Mr. Graf mentioned earlier, dropouts from the Honors College may return to the university, but the majority withdrew from the University of Oregon and we obtained a very wide range of reasons: from marriage to a horror of rain.

In analyzing honors and fellowships we found that three times as many women as men were Phi Beta Kappa in the Honors College. This is probably related again to the fact that we do not stress grades per se but that women are just better grade getters. One-third of the women who are going on to graduate school have fellowships--and some very good fellowships.

With regard to counseling, the problem of course is clearly different for men and women. Men have a choice of vocations and women have the choice of either taking or not taking a vocation. This is reflected in counseling--the number of people going to counselors. We found that consistently more men than women seek interviews with counselors. Thus, 41% of the men and 28% of the women went more than twice for a counseling interview. We have other programs in which we try to acquaint students with career opportunities. One of these is the WICHE Program (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education) where students can intern for the summer in one of the state agencies, usually related to social welfare, and receive credit for doing so. We have attracted a number of honors students to this. The National Science Foundation summer scholarships have also been a way of attracting bright students, and the state of Oregon, until a recent budget cut, had a state governmental internship program which also attracted studeents.

What are the career choices of the Honors College woman? Of the 38 women who so far have graduated or who are graduating, 6 are married, but of these at least 3 are teaching; 7 are teaching, mostly in secondary schools--only 2 in elementary schools; 2 are in the Peace Corps; 14 are in graduate school; one is a reporter for the Associated Press; and 8 are missing. Of course, as was mentioned earlier, it is still much too early to tell where they are going because many of them may go back to graduate school and many of them may get married while in graduate school.

Finally, the question was raised on the program agenda as to whether there are some regional factors, regional differences, beyween various programs and would this affect the program? I suspect that most of the students at the University of Oregon come from smaller towns. Our out-of-state students are roughly 18%. There is still in Oregon a pioneer spirit--a last frontier. So one might be inclined to say these students might go back to these small towns, but the indication I have from interviews is that the Honors College students are probably not going back. While they are not rebels, I have the feeling that they are not the people who are settling back in the smaller towns and this is particularly true of the women.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Walter D. Weir

Phil said I had 15 minutes and we want to get some discussion in here. I want to give you some statistics and a list of complaints from women students.

Our freshmen are also sweet, naive, mostly from small towns. Though I must say that instead of the freshmen women turning younger and younger, they are appearing to me (some of them) more voluptuous, more sophisticated.

The freshmen in honors are selected on the basis of test scores, high school rankings, motivations, etc., and 60% of them are women. But by the time of the senior year it's exactly reversed--60% are men and 40% are women. Of those graduating with honors this year 37% are women--this in spite of the fact that over 50% of the graduating class is female. This 37%, and this is a relatively small number, represents 21 women. At Colorado, in order to graduate with honors, it is not simply a matter of going through the program. One has to take comprehensive exams in the senior year. We find a good number of women just refuse to take them. But of those 21, 75% are going on to graduate school. This is good news. Incidentally, I just heard the other day that the Danforth Foundation, beginning next year, is opening up its scholarships for women.

Now--the complaints. I've been in this office for eight years, haven't yet got the purple couch in, but they stream in with one complaint after another. The first complaint is that college is boring. Now I don't know about other institutions but I think that it is true that there is a national scandal that takes place in the freshman and sophomore years. Unfortunately at Colorado we do not have a complete honors program in the freshman year for these women. We try to do the best we can to provide them with a challenge at this level, but they are bored. They are bored by the lack of interest on the part of the faculty. They are bored by the fact that so much of the work is done under graduate assistants. They are bored with the classes that are running 200 and 300 and demanding regurgitation of the multiple choice type thing, and I might say that I am particularly qualified to talk about this this year, since my wife is finishing up her education, getting her A.B. at last--sweating out a bunch of sheer nonsense. I wish she were here so we could get her full response.

Well, that's the first complaint--that college is boring, and a number of them throughout the college say, "Well, why stay at this nonsense? "So they seek to fulfill themselves as mothers. But, fortunately, for these women there is a two-year gap, I think, in our culture at the freshman level in college. By that I mean that women are approximately two years ahead in maturation. This means that they find college men boring, particularly the freshmen and sophomores. They can't find the right man. So they hang on. If they hang on for two years then there is a possibility of saving them.

The next complaint these women bring to me is that no one has informed them in any realistic way of what lies ahead. They do come to college of course with the vague notion of the possibility of a career, but it is very vague. They do come to college with the notion of getting married. And they do come to college particularly with the insurance policy outlook. That is, the parents who have gone through the depression years have urged upon them the necessity of becoming physical therapists, preparing themselves to teach school, or something very, very articulate and vocational. But no one has told them in any concrete way what their lives ahead are likely to be. That is, what about twenty years from graduation? Very few, particularly as freshmen and sophomores, have given much thought to this and no one has bothered to elucidate it in any way. By the time they are juniors and seniors they tend to be doing a little thinking in this direction.

Next, and this is I think widespread, not only at the University of Colorado, but throughout the country, and applies to men as well as women--we do a very inadequate job of providing concrete information as to what possibilities exist in careers. Our men are about as misinformed as our women are in this regard. They simply don't know. What really does one do in this career or that? What opportunities are available? What does this require by way of training? Sure, the pre-medical students know the path pretty well, or the pre-law students, but this after all is only a small range. Women need to be much better informed as to what opportunities are available to them in profession after profession and what the requirements are to enter them.

Next, these women complain about men. They complain because the male does not understand their aspirations. I'm not at all sure that the gas station operator will do the trick, John, maybe you're right, but I don't think so. As our women go on through honors, the more education they get, the more perception and sensitivity they develop, the harder it is to find the corresponding male. I don't know how many senior honors students--attractive girls, bright, perceptive, understanding--simply have not had a date for the last six months. Again, maybe this is peculiar to Colorado, but I don't think so. This raises a problem that I wish we could explore in this conference--the problem of women realizing themselves as human beings and what that means in relationship to the other sex. Last night Bruno Bettelheim talked about the woman as mother and I assume of course that only women can become mothers and I don't think that's the problem. I think the problem lies, as I would like to suggest, in terms of the psychological dimensions of what it means to be a woman and a man and whether as a matter of fact we do not need to develop in both men and women so-called male and female characteristics. I'd like to develop that but I've been given only fifteen minutes so I'd better stop.

Women need to realize themselves as human beings. This, I think, more and more of our women are beginning to see. But what they don't see is how are they going to do it. And it's not simply a matter of informing them that there actually are opportunities. I think it's something deeper than that.

GROUP DISCUSSION #1

Identifying and Promoting the Efficient Use of Talent Among College Women

Leader: C. Easton Rothwell, President, Mills College

Reported by: R. Jean Brownlee, Dean, College for Women, University of Pennsylvania

The first question considered was the problem of reliable methods for selecting women with special talent. The following were found to be useful: high school grade point averages; the College Entrance Examination Board and American Council on Education tests upon entrance; position in the graduating class; and careful scrutiny of the recommendations of high school teachers. Grades are not necessarily an indicator because they may be results of verbalization and memorization and not of intellectual involvement. It was agreed that none of the methods mentioned was entirely satisfactory.

Paul Heist was invited to discuss identification and he mentioned the value of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey test for the study of values and the Strong Vocational Interest Test. He described in detail the Omnibus Personality Inventory that was developed at the Berkeley Center for the Study of Higher Education. These tests are "Autonomy," "Religious Liberalism," "Interest and Ideas," "Theoretical Orientation," "Aesthetic Characteristics and Complexity." The objective of these tests is to attempt to define the pattern of the intellectually oriented person and to determine the variety of youth that enters specific colleges and the variety of youth who stay in college.

The group considered whether they were seeking high academic achievement or special talents. It was decided that these may be closely related, but the further question was raised as to whether they were looking for actual achievers or potential achievers. It was agreed that talent may not appear at the beginning of college. Some schools select honors students at the end of the first semester rather than on the basis of data obtainable at admission. If they are admitted on the traditional basis, they are selected for honors after they arrive.

It was pointed out that the general academic achiever is rewarded but special talent may not be discovered, developed or rewarded. The person with special talent might transfer, leave school or become an inconspicuous "C."

Women are more likely to have high grade point averages and there is less likelihood of discrepancy between grade averages in women of talent than in men. The most talented women may not be willing to push themselves to meet the demands of a system. Creative students may be highly self-disciplined in the field of their talent (painting, dance, music, etc.), but otherwise "bohemian."

It was agreed that probably less is known about the complexities in the case of women. It was also felt that there is an antiquated stereotype of the compliant, cooperative girls, but very little knowledge of what goes on beneath the surface. All remembered the "C" student who excelled at a later date.

The question was raised as to how to provide an environment for the flowering of talent. It was suggested that basic courses might be put aside and that faculty and students together search for the student's self-discovery. This close relationship might be difficult in a large institution but the size of the section is more significant than the size of an institution. If the institution does not find the talented student she may be lost. Colleges should aim for identification of talent in all areas rather than in the honors program.

The great difference in the search for men and women is in the life pattern of women, a difference in life expectations. Continuing education programs have been developed to help women to return to campus. "Dropout" figures for women do not have their former significance because it is expected that many women will return. There is not enough experience yet to know the influence these mature women will have on the undergraduates. They should help the undergraduate women to have a clearer concept of the life they will lead.

Suppression of talent may be more prevalent among men who are rebels. Women are more likely to shrink. They also live in a world of two values, college and the outside world. It was agreed that these outside pressures may reflect their class level, as well as their individual personality and that of their husbands. It was discovered that new patterns are evolving among the younger college educated groups in their attitudes toward continuing education and paid employment. The role of women is changing and there is a need to know more about the talented.

The group concluded that there seem to be very encouraging trends in the role after college but much needs to be known about the detection and development of talents in the undergraduate.

GROUP DISCUSSION #2

Changing the Honors Undergraduate Curriculum for Women: Pros and Cons

Leader: George R. Waggoner, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences,
University of Kansas

Reported by: Sister Enid Smith, College of St. Benedict

The outline notes for this discussion, suggesting pertinent subtopics and focusing aspects, had as its initial statement, "The issue is an old one and yet it is still a vital one." Group II left the issue still vital and promising to become older.

The first question raised by the discussants was "Why women?" It was soon clear that no one present subscribed to the desirability of differentiated curricula for men and women. This rejection of separate programs seemed to be supported by prevailing practice because the question, "Does anyone know of a college with one honors curriculum for men and another for women?" brought no citation of instance. There was, however, no explicit exploration of how honors programs compare in those colleges conducted exclusively for men with those conducted exclusively for women as was suggesed by the topics for discussion. Research on this subject might yield significant results.

Recommendations were made for greater flexibility in course selection by honors students. An existing practice of such flexibility exists at Michigan State University where course requirements for graduation are stated in terms of 180 credits. All specifics about what these credits should be, how many must be taken in residence, and the like, are waived for students admitted to the Honors College. Through a counseling system, assessment is made of the individual student's interests, strengths, and weaknesses. Programs are then individualized as these assessments identify individual student's real needs.

While the group did not subscribe to special content in an honors program for women, a strong case was made for the desirability of serious attention to the educational context in which a woman learns. Paul A. Heist gave some data reports on disabilities sustained by women in pursuing in a masculine-dominated environment a field of study traditionally thought of as a discipline proper to men. He made an earnest plea for what he termed a "protective environment." With equal force he maintained that securing the protective environment favorable to the success and satisfaction of learning on the part of women does not entail a lessening of intellectualism. His studies suggested additional research needs.

GROUP DISCUSSION #3

Problems of Counseling Talented Undergraduate Women

Leader: Lois E. Langland, Counseling Center, University of California, Los Angeles

Reported by: Dorothy R. Ross, Counseling Center, Michigan State University

The concept of counseling, as it was used in Group #3 discussion, varied in its meaning from any interaction of the young woman with her professors, academic advisors, parents or family friends in professional fields, to the more specifically defined interaction of the student with the psychologically trained counselor. Consequently, the problems covered in the discussion were those encountered by the sum total of all who are engaged in women's higher education programs.

The first half of the session was focused on goals in counseling talented college women. The purposes of counseling as expressed by the group were:

1. To help the talented woman to live with the frustration which accompanies being a member of a minority group and to encourage her to strive for the fullest use of her potential ability.

2. To stimulate the college girl to be creative in all of her life experiences, whether these include professional life or are exclusively the roles of wife, mother and homemaker, so that she can see a way of living an enriched life not dependent on working for financial reward.

3. To help women recognize the need for global planning since changing conditions in society, such as earlier marriage and briefer span of years devoted to child-bearing, predict a smaller portion of the total life expectancy will be used in this traditional feminine activity.

4. To advise talented women students in the selection of rigorous courses which will encourage development of their intellectual capacities and prepare them for graduate work.

5. To assist women in making appropriate career choices based on accurate, meaningful information compiled from reliable

resources, and drawn from significant self examination of interests and aptitudes.

6. To teach young women that privileges of professional life carry obligations which they must respect, and luxuries of special attention accorded to them as women which they must expect to forego while performing on the job.

7. To help these women to integrate their multiple roles in a personally satisfying manner.

The second half of the session was devoted to the question raised by the Conference Committee as to how this Conference could stimulate new ways of thinking concerning these problem areas and develop new approaches for further study. The ideas for counseling talented women always brought the group back to the need for counseling the significant men in the girls lives, whether they were their professors, advisors, counselors, boy friends, husbands or fathers, as the attitudes of men as perceived by the girls greatly influenced their goals and aspirations.

The following were recommendations growing out of the discussion:

1. Coordinators of honors programs have a responsibility to be well informed themselves and then to devise meaningful ways to communicate the implications of the changing cultural conditions to all persons engaged in counseling or advising undergraduate women. They should assume leadership in securing information already available from research studies, government publications such as U. S. Department of Labor reports and journals such as A.A.U.W.'s Education of Women. The persons responsible for honors programs should institute regular follow-up studies of the graduates and the dropouts of honors programs to secure current information, which could be helpful in the counseling of talented women. All such information should be communicated to the college faculty.

2. Honors program leaders should work toward strengthening the academic advising system by:

   a. advocating careful selection of advisors by committees representing more than one discipline.

   b. rewarding the advisor with appropriate financial support and recognition of his work as a consideration for advancement.

   c. limiting the number of students assigned to one advisor so that time may be available to spend with each student.

3. Members of the ICSS should work toward eliminating discrimination on the basis of sex in the awarding of grants and fellowships. Those responsible for honors programs should encourage department chairmen to employ women on their faculties who exemplify the successful integration of personal and professional life so that they may serve as models for women students and as proof for the male faculty that women can successfully combine these roles.

4. Institutions should be encouraged to rid themselves of archaic practices, which may have been appropriate in an earlier day, but now serve only to discourage both men and women from completing degrees.

5. Cooperation should be sought with any university communications media such as university television, radio, newspapers, alumni magazines, etc., to disseminate information which could bring to the attention of parents, alumni and the larger community changes taking place in women's lives and the importance of planning for the total life span of today's and tomorrow's talented women.

Since honors programs are concerned with talented women in the American college, our group tended to feel that one of the greatest contributions that this Conference could make would be to bring these concerns to the attention of college and university administrators, using the full weight of influence of the ICSS to bear on the consideration of these proposals.

GROUP DISCUSSION #4

Career Choices of Talented Women

Leader: Felice N. Schwartz, President, Catalyst

Reported by: Rhodes Dunlap, Director of Honors, University of Iowa

The discussion began with basic matters. Admitting that women's capacities are similar to men's, we must still take into account the self-image which is projected in women's education. A study of Vassar students has shown the general conviction that only marriage and children can lead to complete self-fulfillment; intellectual and creative values are second best. Such a conviction would not seem to encourage professional achievement, and it raises questions as to the goals colleges can and should set. A second special circumstance is the woman's biological role, which imposes the interruptions and responsibilities of motherhood. For many married women there will be complementary sequences of family and work, and thus some special consideration should go to interruptible and part-time callings. Time not occupied by children can be spent more usefully if well prepared for; colleges should provide assistance toward this goal. A third special circumstance is the attitude of society as brought to bear by educators and employers, both men and women.

At Radcliffe and elsewhere it is observed that many women students are still concerned with the assumed dilemma of intellectuality versus femininity, though their elders may consider this a dead issue. Women students demand reassurance. This may be a more pronounced problem now than twenty-five years ago. There are differences in this respect between campuses. In Bryn Mawr College last year 68 percent of the seniors, married and unmarried, went on to graduate study. Apparently this was the result of a college ethos which specifies graduate study. Except for the married students, who might have an excuse, there would be a sense of guilt at not going to graduate school. But students impelled by such motives are not likely to complete their graduate training. At the undergraduate level, in some coeducational colleges, women students are inclined to hold back in class participation out of deference to men students. At still other campuses the women's fear of conspicuous scholastic achievement has largely disappeared.

In the long run the educational process should try to change undesirable social modes, and there have been rapid changes of late. There is now a more favorable attitude toward part-time graduate study such as would be helpful to many women, and there are even fellowships for such study, as part of a general trend toward flexibility and enlarged opportunity. A big question is that of the future labor market. The well-known variety of professional callings pursued by women in the Soviet Union invites, if not imitation, at least a close look at prospects here. Women lawyers still meet widespread discrimination, though large law firms employ women for assignments not involving courtroom practice. There is a demand for talented women research assistants in industry and the universities. The profession of dentistry might be suitable for part-time practice by women, especially since there is a shortage of male candidates for the dental schools. In Denmark three-fourths of the dentists are women. In this country, where the image of the woman dentist might seem a strange one, perhaps orthodontics would be a suitable specialty. Another possible new area for professional women is pharmacy.

Quite apart from these specific suggestions is the necessity of serious engagement in the chosen line of work. Among many employees there is a strong and not always unjustified stereotype as to the undependability of women and the questionable worth of part-time employees. But often the happy mother, though not able to continue at work full-time, may be more successful than the less enthusiastic full-time worker. And the very conception of "full-time" is today no long an absolute one.

Many middle-aged college graduates find that both wife and husband must work to give their children advantages comparable to those they themselves have enjoyed. This is a kind of motivation not usually realized during student years.

Currently in colleges most professional training for women consists in the earning of a teacher's certificate, sometimes to the disregard of the student's more distinctive talents and interests. Better use should be made of the various channels of communication, including honors programs, by which information on professional opportunities might effectively reach talented women students.

GROUP DISCUSSION #5

After Honors and Graduation: What Happens?

Leader: Robert D. Clark, Dean of the Faculties, University of Oregon

Reported by: Marjorie Adams, Assistant Dean and Director of the Arts and Sciences Honors Program, Kansas State University

The group approached its topic from three dimensions: the state immediately after graduation, the state fifteen or more years later, and university training for the student returning after fifteen or more years.

According to U. S. Office of Education statistics 80% of all women graduates of American colleges and universities are employed in various jobs and professions immediately after having received the baccalaureate. Group representatives testified to varying percentages of honors women attending graduate school after having received the Bachelor of Arts or the Bachelor of Science degree. The percentage ranged from 50% to 100%, with the great majority of the discussants claiming around 80% of honors women graduates going immediately into graduate school. The group considered possible reasons for this high percentage and concluded that students in honors programs were encouraged to go on to graduate school and that graduate schools tended to prefer honors program students because of the experience these students had in writing undergraduate honors essays and preparing scholarly studies.

With respect to the second dimension, the state of honors graduates fifteen or more years later, group members considered a highly restricted population, specifically wives of college professors. Forced to rely on personal experience for information in this area, they testified to the fact that most of these graduates did not have professional careers. Many of the graduates at this particular time were contented; many were also discontented.

With respect to the last category, the participants recommended university training in preparation for the beginning of a professional career for those women who desired it. As time was the key to the problem, namely a student returning after fifteen or twenty years away from the academic environment, so time was the key to the solution. The solution each individual in the group thought lay in extending the amount of time generally required to receive either the Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, or the doctorate. Orientation courses, such as those conducted by Sarah Lawrence College, would be fine as well as extensive academic counseling, such as the University of Minnesota now uses, prior to the returning student's launching once more upon an academic career because of a possible shift of interest in the interim of time between the last formal academic training and the beginning of the second period. Another possibility, also utilized by the University of Minnesota, is the part-time load or more specifically one-half the load currently considered a regular load for a student. Another device would be extending the statute of limitations currently observed with respect to the completion of advanced degrees. Still another experiment, summer institutes for the returning student such as the University of Michigan currently employs, could be most helpful.

The group concluded that in the future additional experimentation along the lines already being investigated by Sarah Lawrence, University of Minnesota, and the University of Michigan would be in order. It further recommended additional fellowships being made available to women immediately upon completion of their undergraduate work as well as additional scholarships to women returning to a university after having been away for several years. These scholarships might be granted by universities, the state government, and the federal government. Universities should also attempt to grant additional professorships to women. Finally, society, the group felt, might be urged along lines of change with respect to making available additional part-time jobs and attempting to dignify domestic service.

GROUP DISCUSSION #6

Talented Women in the Professions

Leader: Lewis N. Pino, Program Director, Talented Undergraduate Student Program, National Science Foundation

Reported by: Marjorie K. McCorquodale, English Department, University of Houston

The obstacles encountered by superior or talented women in the pursuit of professional careers arise, it appeared, from two sources.

The first difficulty might be described in terms of an ambiguous, even a contradictory self-image. A superior woman considers herself, in many cases, both to be and not to be a professional person committed to a life-involvement with a central interest. Perhaps because of traditional social attitudes, even a woman who has chosen a career and is following it imposes upon herself unnecessary household tasks in her attempt to reconcile two roles which she has been taught to believe are contradictory. Such ambiguity may be eliminated in either of two ways, the discussants agreed.

On the one hand, talented young women may be encouraged to identify themselves early with a profession, choosing their specialty as early as high school, in some cases; while they are college undergraduates, the interest of such women may be aroused in the unsolved problems to be found in their area of specialization. Furthermore, research assistantships may be granted to undergraduate women who have exhibited special ability,a step which encourages continuous professional activity after graduation.

On the other hand, able women may be re-educated as to their self-image in terms of a realistic reconciling of their life-style with the demands of life-long intellectual or professional activity. An important part of such re-education might be the association or acquaintance with successful professional women in their own area of interest. By the life-style of women is meant the necessity at times for their withdrawal from professional activities for the purpose of bearing children or caring for them. It might be pointed out to talented women that the period of child care represents a comparatively small proportion of an expected life-span of approximately eighty years. If a woman is to fulfill the promise of her talent and ability, she must be encouraged persistently to remain conversant with developments in her field during her withdrawal period. Whether adequate alertness is possible for such women in the sciences with the immense amount of data now being processed would be a matter of individual decision.

The second obstacle talented women encounter in pursuit of their professional activities is to be found in the resistance of certain professional groups to the employment of women. The discussants agreed that the American Medical Association as well as the legal profession tended to discourage women from electing medicine or the law as their life work and that women who nevertheless do so encounter great difficulties in finding appropriate employment, no matter how well qualified they are. Superior women, it was decided, must be encouraged to assume the leadership required to overcome these limiting traditional attitudes. Furthermore, those women who have responsibly filled such roles in the professions should selectively encourage other able members of their sex to enter these professions.

The teaching profession, it was pointed out, is less resistant than some others to the employment of women, probably because women have traditionally filled this role. At the college level, however, there is discrimination against women both as to employment and as to salary, particularly in the east. Although one out of three women changes her major at the undergraduate level to education, statistics show, a minority of superior women choose education as a major, hence only a minority find their way into administrative positions in the schools since these positions generally are filled, one discussant pointed out, by education majors through a self-perpetuating hierachy.

Few American women elect careers in the sciences; yet the performance of Russian women in these fields indicates that scientific ability is not sex-linked. More stimulating undergraduate courses in the sciences and the publicizing of areas not overcrowded such as anthropology, geology, meteorology, and others might open to women fields not yet preempted by men, it was suggested.

In summary, women must learn to think differently of themselves, and society must be encouraged to think differently of them, if the potential abilities of talented women are to be utilized to the fullest for the satisfaction of such women and for the enrichment of society.

GROUP DISCUSSION #7

Regional and Community Variations in Opportunity for the Woman of Talent

Leader: Eleanor F. Dolan, Research Director, American Association of University Women

Reported by: Warren Roberts, Chairman, Honors Committee, Newcomb College, Tulane University

The discussants emphasized that problems transcend regions. They exist to a greater or lesser degree in all parts of the country. In other words, as one individual put it, we have become homogenized, but in some areas there is more cream, in others, more skim. The one region that was focused upon as being "peculiar" was the South, but in general it was agreed that the South simply had problems that are more visible than in other areas. The difference was one of degree, not of kind. Various specific "Southern" problems were discussed.

A great deal of attention was given to the Negro problem. Lack of opportunity for talented Negro women was emphasized, but it was evident that this problem exists everywhere. Negro women lack opportunity in every region and in every community.

Another problem was the "Southern attitude" toward girls--the feeling that they should become "young ladies" rather than be challenged by college or university education generally or honors programs specifically. The discussants agreed that this is a stereotype and exists only to a certain degree in the South. It also exists elsewhere. Rather than its being a regional problem, it is one identified with communities, especially small ones. It might be considered part of the general problem of anti-intellectualism, or, put in another way, of educating parents to assume different attitudes.

The threat of the untalented woman was suggested as a great barrier to the talented woman in typical southern colleges. But it was also argued that this was part of the problem of the relationship between the talented and untalented generally. It is a national problem, although it might exist to a greater degree in the South.

The lack of money for effective education in the South was pointed up as was the lack of job opportunities for talented women. Southern poverty of one sort or another, cultural poverty, for example, was mentioned. The claim that the South also was different because educated women who are liberals cannot put into action their liberalism was introduced. The general consensus was that the South insofar as it is different is typical of a "disadvantaged area," wherever found. It simply experiences the same problems all other areas experience but does so in a more acute fashion. Other regions were not discussed specifically, however.

Community differences were discussed, and there seemed to be agreement that larger communities offered, (a) more educational opportunities (cooperation of different colleges in an urban area was cited); (b) better job opportunities; and (c) better attitudes toward talented women playing active roles. It was also the consensus that smaller communities subject women to more restraints.

As for research suggestions, specific proposals were made to the effect that we need more knowledge concerning: (a) talented women leaving disadvantaged areas for greener pastures and not returning; (b) opportunities for talented women in non-urban areas (what are they and how well known are they); and (c) the ways in which the first general college experiences affect girls in different areas and communities. It was suggested that more research was needed in every area with which the discussion was concerned, because the discussants' generalizations were based on inadequate evidence. Ray P. Cuzzort answered that considerable data is available. Fundamentally, the problem is to develop significant questions and concepts.

Many interesting observations were made that had little bearing on the topic. Of great importance, was Eleanor Dolan's suggestion that there is a need to interest talented women in voluntary activities, not just paying jobs. She referred to various things that might be done and suggested visiting colleges and counseling students as potentially productive activities. Such would be an especially valuable contribution for a successful career woman to make voluntarily.

GROUP DISCUSSION #8

Specific Problems Confronting Talented Women

Leader: Esther Raushenbush, Director, Center for Continuing
Education, Sarah Lawrence College

Reported by: Richard R. Marsh, Assistant Director, James Scholars
Program, University of Illinois

Mrs. Raushenbush suggested that the group consider the kind of life talented and educated women could have, but she emphasized that she did not want a discussion of discrimination against women. She went on to suggest that women's colleges should provide opportunities for women, not a protective situation. Do women's colleges have a special function outside of providing study in mathematics and the sciences? In response, it was pointed out that the most impressive thing about women's colleges is that students do not need to apologize for functioning as intellectuals in an intellectual atmosphere. A further suggestion was that there are three types or choices among colleges for women: (1) the typical coeducational institution; (2) the college for women; and (3) the egalitarian institution like Antioch and others. This involves the spirit of the institution rather than the environment. Does it make much difference what kind of college the talented woman attends?

A study of Vassar graduates of the classes of 1925-30 was briefly described. It showed that these women were strongly intellectually oriented regardless of their careers. In a similar study of the class of 1957-58, the faculty was called upon to nominate ideal students. Some were chosen because of their grade point averages, some for other reasons. These women showed the same characteristics as those who were graduated between 1925 and 1930. For many, intellectual orientation was possessed when they arrived at Vassar. College only gave them the tools to develop competence. On the other hand, there was a study of the interest in public affairs possessed by boys in a fine men's school. They found that very few developed interest in public affairs during their college years in spite of an intellectual orientation.

Are there differences in men and women that require that something different be done for women? Highly talented men and women share many characteristics. In honors programs they can share experiences as people and also as men and women. While this

has merit, colleges should encourage girls to pattern their lives on realities. They should be encouraged to relate themselves and their education to realities. The problem is to persuade them of the realities of what lies ahead. Here were two issues. First of all, the capacity of woman to live by herself with her talents. Second, the social milieu in which she will move after college. Can college help her cope with this? We have never in education recognized the basic difference in the life patterns of men and women. They are not the same.

Is there a difference in such things as cognitive style or approach to learning? Women are likely to be pristine, and silly, and intellectual at the same time. Should there be a difference in the way they are taught? Perhaps women are more intuitive. In answer to this, it was emphasized that there are differences between people and sexes, but these differences are slight and colleges should not become involved with them. Roger Walmsley suggested, however, that his own experience with intellectually oriented women at the University of Pennsylvania indicated that women do differ from men in cognitive style. Talented women can approach mathematics more happily than physics. More go into mathematics than physics even though physics also is mathematical. Physics, however, has been masculinized through the use of machines and equipment.

Talented girls find little difficulty in approaching a discipline like abstract math. Boys and girls approach this on equal terms. This is not the case with the physical sciences. You might expect there would be a high carry over between physics and math, but there is not. For some reason talented boys are able to move into physics with more motivation than talented girls. Still, at the other end of the distribution - those people who have to take physics, rather than those who want to take it - girls stick it out better than boys. Boys are more impatient. In chemistry, girls do better and there are more of them who take chemistry honors. Girls who take physics honors are really apart from the other women in the honors program.

Can you teach physics differently? Yes. Will it be an improvement? Questionable. Walmsley raised the question of emotional structure and intellectual structure. There is a definite relationship between emotion make-up and the way a person works. In the teaching of physics they use the adversary method. One student against another. This is not so true in chemistry and mathematics. Math is spelled out as a logical system. It might be rigorous, but it is tight. There is a

neatness and an orderliness. Girls who do well in math are themselves neat and orderly. Their brand of logic is neat and orderly. This is not true of physics. You solve a problem first and then find out why it is true. It is highly intuitive. It is easier to reach this intuition in boys. Girls are less willing to guess and less willing to be attacked. They are less willing to engage in this kind of dialogue or risk taking. David Riesman suggested that women are not playful intellectually. Playfulness is not part of the style of a girl. They can be taught this, however.

All this suggested that college should have an impact on women. Colleges should educate women so that they might achieve complete fulfillment. Esther Raushenbush described five types of women past the period of college. 1) The woman whose profession is central to life. She never marries. She is willing to give up marriage and family. 2) The woman who wants a profession and wants also to be married. She gets her training for a profession and practices it. Success depends on her ability to unite marriage and a profession. 3) The woman who in college wanted a husband. At age 30 to 35, after being successful in marriage, she finds that something she learned in college does something to her and she has to start from there. 4) The woman who works, stops, has children, starts another career even different from the first one. 5) The woman who wants home and domestic life. She fulfills herself in these ways. She believes colleges should educate women so that they might achieve all of these.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE HOST INSTITUTION,
Columbia University
- PAGLIARO, Harold
- ANDERSON, Quentin
- MUSTARD, Helen M.

ICSS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
- CAMERON, Edward A., University of North Carolina
- CLARK, Robert D., San Jose State College
- COHEN, Joseph W., University of Colorado
- *FRANKLIN, John H., Chicago University
- JOHNSON, Robert E., University of Illinois
- MacLEOD, Robert B., Cornell University
- *McMURRIN, Sterling W., University of Utah
- *MEAD, Margaret, American Museum of Natural History
- *QUINT, Howard H., University of Massachusetts
- *ROBERTSON, James H., University of Michigan
- *STRONG, Edward W., University of California (Berkeley)
- *TAYLOR Cecil G., Louisiana State University
- WAGGONER, George R., University of Kansas
- *WYNN, Dudley, University of New Mexico

ICSS STAFF
- MITTERLING, Philip I., Director
- WEIR, Walter D., Associate Director
- CUZZORT, Ray P., Research Associate
- LOVELACE, Walter B., Editorial Associate
- SCHAFER, Linnie W., Administrative Assistant
- LEFLER, Mary Ann
- CUNDIFF, Tildie E.

- ADAMS, Henry, Western Washington State College
- ADAMS, Marjorie, Kansas State University
- ANDERSON, Florence, Carnegie Corporation of New York
- BAIN, Elizabeth, CBS Television Stations
- BANNER, William A., Howard University
- BARBER, Sherburne F., The City College
- BASKERVILLE, Barnet, University of Washington
- BETTELHEIM, Bruno, University of Chicago
- BEYER, Robert Carlyle, University of Miami
- BROWN, Donald R., University of Michigan (formerly at Bryn Mawr)

*-Not present at conference

BROWNLEE, R. Jean, University of Pennsylvania
DOLAN, Eleanor F., American Association of University Women
DONLON, Mary H., United States Customs Court
DUNLAP, Rhodes, University of Iowa
EDWARDS, Wallace I., Miami University (Ohio)
EELLS, John S., Jr., Winthrop College
ELLIOTT, Kathleen O., Radcliffe College
ELLIS, Virginia, Mount Holyoke College
FIDES, Sister, The College of St. Catherine
FROBES, Virginia, University of Utah
GILLMOR, Donald M., University of North Dakota
GRAF, Otto, University of Michigan
HAMMOND, Geraldine, University of Wichita
HARRISON, J. A., University of Florida
HEIST, Paul A., University of California (Berkeley)
KELLY, E. Lowell, University of Michigan
KURLAND, Norman D., New York State Education Department
LANGLAND, Lois E., University of California (Los Angeles)
LAWRENCE, Ray Margaret, Brooklyn College
LUNINE, M. J., Fisk University
McCORQUODALE, Marjorie K., University of Houston
MACGREGOR, Frances Cooke, Cornell University-New York Hospital School of Nursing
MAHONEY, Margaret E., Carnegie Corporation of New York
MARQUIS, Lucian C., University of Oregon
MARSH, Richard R., University of Illinois
MARSHALL, Mary H.,Syracuse University
MERRY, Margaret Habein, Boston University
MILLER, Harold W., Bucknell University
MINKIN, Vera F., Bronx Community College
OLSEN, James K., Kent State University
PARKER, Thomas W. University of Arizona
PINKUS, A. G., Baylor University
PINO, Lewis N., National Science Foundation
RAUSHENBUSH, Esther, Sarah Lawrence College
REES, Mina, City University of New York
REYNOLDS, Alice J., Goucher College
RIDDLE, James, Ohio State University
RIESMAN, David, Harvard University
ROBERTS, Warren, Newcomb College
ROCHFORD, Paul A., Hiram College
ROSS, Dorothy R., Michigan State University

ROTHWELL, C. Easton, Mills College
SCHWARTZ, Felice N., Catalyst
SHEPARD, Loraine V., Michigan State University
SHRELL, Darwin H., Louisiana State University
SMITH, Constance E., Radcliffe College
SMITH, Sister Enid, College of Saint Benedict
SOBEL, Eli, University of California (Los Angeles)
STANFORD, Ann, San Fernando Valley State College
TRAPP, E. Philip, University of Arkansas
TRILLING, Diana
TRILLING, Lionel, Columbia University
WALMSLEY, Roger H., University of Pennsylvania
WARD, Paul E., Sarah Lawrence College
WELTER, Rush, Bennington College
WHITE, Carol, Radcliffe College